Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

"(4) All process of the Labor Court may be served anywhere in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof."

(19) Section 12 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 12. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with the Administrator or any of his agents or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this Act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both."

(20) Section 14 is amended by substituting the words "Labor Court" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(21) Section 18 is hereby stricken.

SEC. 20. TRANSFER OF PROCEEDINGS TO THE LABOR COURT.—

On the effective date of this Act, proceedings pending before the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board or before the National Labor Relations Board shall be suspended and thereafter transferred as expeditiously as possible to the Administrator or to the Labor Court in the following manner:

(1) Proceedings pending before the General Counsel in which no formal action has been taken shall be transferred to the Administrator, who shall dispose of them in the manner prescribed herein and in accordance with the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

(2) Proceedings pending before the National Labor Relations Board shall be transferred to the Labor Court for hearing and decision, de novo: *Provided, however,* That the Labor Court may, at the discretion of the trial judge, treat any intermediate report and recommendation issued by a trial examiner of the National Labor Relations Board as if it were a report and recommendation made by a commissioner of the Labor Court.

(3) Any decision and order issued by the National Labor Relations Board prior to the effective date of this Act which has not as of the effective date of this Act been enforced or reviewed by a court of appeals having jurisdiction under the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to enforce and review such decision shall have full force and effect and shall be subject to enforcement or review in accordance with the provisions of section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act as heretofore amended. In respect to the enforcement or review of any such case in the courts of appeals, the Administrator of the Labor Court shall exercise the function and have the authority and responsibility vested in the National Labor Relations Board by the National Labor Relations Act, as heretofore amended.

SEC. 21. This Act shall take effect on the one hundred and eightieth day after the day of its enactment.

THE MILITARY ASSISTANCE AND SALES ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 679

Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. PEARSON) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3583) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward internal and external security, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. LAUSCHE which appears under a separate heading.)

THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 680

Mr. JAVITS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3584) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. JAVITS which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 681

Mr. McGOVERN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 682

Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 683 THROUGH 688

Mr. GRUENING submitted six amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendments when submitted by Mr. GRUENING, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENTS NOS. 689 THROUGH 693

Mr. HARTKE submitted five amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3584, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled for Wednesday, July 27, 1966, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, Seventh Circuit, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372, approved March 18, 1966.

Thomas E. Fairchild, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. circuit judge, Seventh Circuit, Vice F. Ryan Duffy, retired.

Ted Cabot, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge, Southern District of Florida, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89–372, approved March 18, 1966.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON S. 2479

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, has scheduled a public hearing on S. 2479. This bill would amend section 4 of the Clayton Act to treat as a penalty judgment imposed upon defendants in treble damage suits by the United States for violations of the antitrust laws.

These hearings will be held on Tuesday, July 27, and Wednesday, July 28, commencing at 10 a.m. in room 1318, New Senate Office Building. There will be further hearings at a later date to be announced.

Anyone who wishes to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate with the office of the subcommittee, room 412, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225–5573.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and myself.

OUR OBLIGATION TO TREAT PRISONERS OF WAR HUMANELY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the United States is signatory to the Geneva Convention requiring humane treatment of prisoners of war. It has been our policy and practice throughout all of our involvement in the miserable civil war raging in Vietnam to surrender and turn over to officers of the ARVN forces all Vietcong prisoners of war we have taken. Our officers in the field in South Vietnam and our officials in Washington, in the name of humanity and decency, should rescind this policy and practice. It is well known that not only are these prisoners of war taken by Americans in combat mistreated following the time they are turned over to South Vietnamese authorities, but also the facts are, and they are well known, that many of these prisoners of war are executed. Probably more of these prisoners of war are executed than are permitted to survive. How can we Americans evade responsibility for the mistreatment of these war prisoners? The Geneva Convention, which had the all-out support of our Government when the provisions were written relative to humane treatment of prisoners of war and agreeing to those provisions, makes us responsible.

The Convention terms this a contingent responsibility. Article 12 of the Convention provides that the transfer of prisoners of war may be made to allies, with a contingent responsibility that

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

(10) Section 9(b) is amended by substituting the words "Labor Court" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(11) Section 9(c)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) Whenever a petition shall have been filed with the Administrator, in accordance with such rules as may be prescribed by the Labor Court—

"(A) by an employee or group of employees or any individual or labor organization acting in their behalf alleging that a substantial number of employees (i) wish to be represented for collective bargaining and that their employer declines to recognize their representative as the representative defined in section 9(a), or (ii) assert that the individual or labor organization, which has been certified or is being currently recognized by their employer as the bargaining representative, is no longer a representative as defined in section 9(a); or

"(B) by an employer, alleging that one or more individuals or labor organizations have presented to him a claim to be recognized as the representative defined in section 9(a); the Administrator shall investigate such petition and unless disposed of by informal agreement of the parties, the petition shall be certified to the Labor Court by the Administrator for the purpose of hearing and appropriate decision. If the Labor Court finds upon the record of such hearing that a question of representation affecting commerce exists, it shall direct an election by secret ballot to be conducted by the Administrator who shall certify the results thereof to the Labor Court."

(12) Section 9(c)(2) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) In determining whether or not a question of representation exists the Labor Court shall make no distinction in its decision because of the identity of the persons filing the petition or the kind of relief sought, and in no case shall the Labor Court deny a labor organization a place on the ballot by reason of any prior decree (or prior order of the National Labor Relations Board) with respect to such labor organization or its predecessor not issued in conformity with section 10(c)."

(13) Section 9(c)(3) is amended by striking the words "under such regulations as the Board shall find are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this Act".

(14) Section 9(c)(4) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the waiving of a hearing by stipulation for the purpose of a consent election in conformity with regulations of the Administrator and applicable decisions of the Labor Court."

(15) Section 9(d) is hereby stricken and section 9(e) is redesignated "(d)".

(16) Section 9(e)(1) is amended by substituting the word "Administrator" for "Board" where the latter appears therein.

(17) Section 10 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) The Labor Court shall have jurisdiction, as hereinafter provided, and unaffected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that had been or may be established by agreement, law, or otherwise, to enjoin any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice (listed in section 8) affecting commerce.

"(b) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, the Administrator, or any agent designated by the Administrator for such purpose, shall investigate such charge and if, after such investigation, there is reasonable cause to believe such charge is true, the Administrator or his agent shall issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges in that respect, and shall file such complaint in the court. No complaint shall issue based upon any unfair labor practice occurring more than six months prior to the filing of the charge and the service of a copy thereof upon the person against whom such charge is made, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the six-month period shall be computed from the day of his discharge. In determining whether a complaint shall issue alleging a violation of section 8(a)(1) or section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, no distinction shall be made because the labor organization affected is or is not affiliated with a labor organization national or international in scope. The charging party shall, and any other person may, in the discretion of the court, be allowed to intervene in the said proceeding and to present evidence. Where the Administrator or his agent refuses to issue a complaint pursuant to a charge alleging the commission of an unfair labor practice, the charging party may appeal to the Labor Court which shall have authority to require the Administrator to issue and cause to be served and filed a complaint based on such charge.

"(c) If the court finds that any person named in the complaint has engaged in or is engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the court shall state its findings of fact and shall enter a decree requiring such person to cease and desist from such unfair labor practice, and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement of employees with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of this Act: *Provided,* That where a decree directs reinstatement of an employee, back pay may be required of the employer or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination suffered by him. If the court finds that the person named in the complaint has not engaged in or is not engaging in any such unfair labor practice, then the court shall state its findings of fact and shall dismiss the said complaint.

"(d) Upon the filing of a complaint, the court shall have jurisdiction, upon application by the Administrator, to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case in which it is alleged and there is reasonable cause to believe that substantial and irreparable injury to the charging party is threatened: *Provided, however,* That no temporary restraining order shall issue without notice to the person named in the complaint: *Provided further,* That a motion for a temporary restraining order shall not be denied where the complaint alleges violations of sections 8(b)(7), 8(e), or of the paragraphs (A), (B), or (C) of section 8(b)(4) and the court has reasonable grounds for believing such allegations to be true: *Provided further,* That no restraining order shall issue with respect to allegations in the complaint of unfair labor practices under section 8(b)(7) if a charge against the employer under section 8(a)(2) has been filed and after the preliminary investigation the Administrator, or any agent designated by the Administrator for that purpose, has reasonable cause to believe that such charge is true, and issues and causes to be served and filed a complaint based on such charge.

"(e) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of paragraph 4(D) of section 8(b) of this Act, the Administrator shall not issue a complaint if, within ten days after such charge has been filed, there is submitted to the Administrator satisfactory evidence that the controversy giving rise to the charge has been settled, or that effective methods for the voluntary adjustment thereof have been agreed upon and that such adjustment will be enforced.

"(f) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of sections 8(b)(7), 8(e), of the paragraphs (A), (B), or (C) of section 8(b)(4), the preliminary investigation of such charge shall be made forthwith and given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred.

"(g) Whenever it is charged that any person has engaged in an unfair labor practice within the meaning of subsection (a)(3) or (b)(2) of section 8, such charge shall be given priority over all other cases except cases of like character in the office where it is filed or to which it is referred and cases given priority under subsection (f)."

(18) Section 11 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. For the purpose of all investigations which, in the opinion of the Administrator, are necessary and proper for the exercise of the powers vested in him by section 9 and section 10—

"(1) The Administrator, or his duly authorized agents, shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy any evidence of any person being investigated or proceeded against that relates to any matter under investigation or in question. The Labor Court shall, upon application of any party to such investigation or proceedings, forthwith issue to such party subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence in such investigation or proceedings requested in such application. Within five days after the service of a subpena on any person requiring the production of any evidence in his possession or under his control, such person may petition the Labor Court to revoke such subpena, and the Labor Court shall revoke such subpena if it finds that the evidence whose production is required does not relate to any matter under investigation, or any matter in question in such proceedings, or if it finds that such subpena does not describe with sufficient particularity the evidence whose production is required. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing;

"(2) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Labor Court, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

"(3) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Labor Court, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person requiring to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Labor Court, a division thereof, or commissioner, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

2

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

such allies—in this particular, the South Vietnamese—do not mistreat the prisoners of war.

Article 12 specifically states:

Prisoners of war are in the hand of the enemy Power, but not of the individuals or military units who have captured them. Irrespective of the individual responsibilities that may exist, the Detaining Power is responsible for the treatment given them.

Prisoners of war may only be transferred by the Detaining Power to a Power which is a party to the Convention and after the Detaining Power has satisfied itself of the willingness and ability of such transferee Power to apply the Convention. When prisoners of war are transferred under such circumstances, responsibility for the application of the Convention rests on the Power accepting them while they are in its custody.

Nevertheless, if that Power fails to carry out the provisions of the Convention in any important respect, the Power by whom the prisoners of war were transferred shall, upon being notified by the Protecting Power, take effective measures to correct the situation or shall request the return of the prisoners of war. Such requests must be complied with.

An argument has been made by some that were the United States to declare war against the Government of North Vietnam, then we would be obligated to treat humanely all prisoners of war taken by us. I assert that even without a formal declaration of war, the demands of humanity and the provisions of the Convention apply to us and should be respected by civilian officials of the U.S. Government and our military officers in the field in Vietnam. This regardless of whether or not there is a declaration of war by us against the Government of North Vietnam.

It is urgent, it seems to me, that we reverse our policy regarding treatment of prisoners of war in Vietnam and accept our responsibility to treat all war prisoners we take with decency and humanity. May I say that the conscience of the world would find it revolting were those governing North Vietnam to place on trial our airmen who have been taken prisoners of war and execute any of them. I would favor the gravest reprisals against any such inhumane action. The lives of our airmen are precious indeed. As members of our Armed Forces, bombing installations in faraway Vietnam, responsive to orders and in accord with their duties as officers and enlisted men in our Armed Forces, they were acting under orders. In every sense of the term, they are prisoners of war, and are entitled to treatment as such, in accord with the Geneva Convention.

I had hoped for an honorable settlement of our involvement in this tragic war in Vietnam—a country which is of no strategic importance whatsoever to the defense of the United States. As stated in a letter termed "A Plea for Sanity," which I signed along with 18 other Senators of the United States, if members of our Armed Forces taken prisoner by those fighting under orders of the Hanoi government should be tried as war criminals and executed, then we indeed would have reached the peril point of no return, and the conflict would become, as stated, "a raging inferno burning away the last barrier of restraint."

The rulers of Hanoi should know that if, by perpetrating such threatened act of cruelty and brutality, they close the door and bar the path of moderation that could lead to a negotiated peace, then truly all Americans would unite behind our President in whatever course of action he might take in such event.

Men in uniform the world over, when captured in the performance of their duty, are entitled to be treated as prisoners of war. They must not be humiliated or mistreated. To try them and then execute them as criminals would be an outrage and in itself a crime against humanity. If the Hanoi government carries out the cruel threat it has made, it is as certain to follow as the night the day that our 7th Fleet and our airpower will destroy Haiphong, its docks, airfields, and missile sites, and then our forces will go on and wreak destruction throughout the Hanoi area.

Here is a sad situation almost too horrible to contemplate. Unfortunately, in the course of our operations in Vietnam, with our tremendous firepowers and napalm bombing, it has been authoritatively stated that for every Vietcong fighting man killed, doubtless four civilians—men, women, and children—have been killed. That ratio will be widened instead of diminished, were the rulers of Hanoi to place in execution and threaten execution of our airmen prisoners of war.

Historically, there is no such thing as North and South Vietnam. The Geneva Accords of 1954 provide:

The military demarcation line at the 17th parallel is provisional and should not in any way be considered as constituting a political boundary.

The entire area of what is termed North and South Vietnam is 2⅓ the size of the area of my State of Ohio. There is this great difference. In Ohio we have no mountain ranges, swamps, or jungles. The population of Ohio is approximately 10 million. Yet Vietnam, which contains mountain ranges that are uninhabitable, thick jungles that are uninhabited, and vast areas of swamps and rice paddies, has a total population of some 32 million, or did have that total population until our tremendous firepower killed so many thousands of Vietcong and civilians.

The escalation of this conflict is bound to result in the deaths of many more civilian women, children, and men in addition to those in the combat forces, formerly termed the Vietminh and now termed the Vietcong.

Let us hope that the rulers of Hanoi will take no action—such as trying our captured airmen as war criminals—which would make such escalation of the war inevitable and would make the deaths of many, many Vietnamese nationals inevitable.

THE FACTS WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY AND THE NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, earlier this week the Senior Senator from Minnesota inserted in the RECORD an article entitled "Saigon Takes Reins of CIA School," which had appeared the previous day on the front page of the New York Times, and asked that a member of one of the CIA subcommittees inform the Senate as to the purported facts in this article.

The Senator from Minnesota described the article as "confused." He is right. The article deals with the South Vietnamese Government's training school for their revolutionary development training program. Much of it is inaccurate in implication as well as in fact.

In passing, it is noted that the Senator misquotes the article when he lists the article's final paragraph. The words "not happy" are used instead of "not unhappy." We are sure this change in the meaning as expressed in the article was inadvertent, and only mention it in the case someone reads the purported quote of the last paragraph but not the last paragraph itself.

The training school in question is not in Saigon. It is in Vung Tau, in the delta. The school was established in 1964 by the Central Intelligence Agency in order to train Vietnamese from the rural areas to defend themselves and their fellow villagers against the political and terrorist incursions of the Vietcong.

The prime objective of this program was to reestablish contact between the villagers and the local authorities, to revive the confidence of the villagers in their local government, and to enlist the active participation of the latter in the war against the Vietcong.

Since its inception, the training at this school has been done by the Vietnamese. The direction and control of the teams, once they return home to begin work, is entirely in the hands of the local district and province chiefs of the South Vietnamese Government.

From its inception, the Central Intelligence Agency has provided the logistic and financial support to the effort. The CIA has also provided civilians who advise provincial officials of the South Vietnamese Government on political and civil problems. This is done in much the same way that American military personnel advise tht same officials on military matters.

As soon as the school was set up and running successfully, the Central Intelligence Agency initiated negotiating to turn over the entire program, including the school, to the South Vietnamese Government. These negotiations were concluded in November 1965, and the South Vietnamese took control in early February 1966.

The South Vietnamese Government thereupon revamped its Rural Construction Ministry and appointed General Thang the Minister of Revolutionary Development. General Thang took over the entire CIA-sponsored cadre as the core of his new Ministry's effort. At that time the general issued a series of decrees which formalized his country's direction and control of the school and the entire program.

The South Vietnamese Government specifically requested that the Central Intelligence Agency continue its logistic and financial support, as well as its ad-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

5

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

visory role, during this transitional period. That is the way the relationship stands today.

As for the situation described in this article in the New York Times, what took place recently was an internal dispute among the Vietnamese staff at Vung Tau, touched off by Minister Thang's replacement of the commander he himself had appointed last February. As a result there was an element of the old staff which resented the changes that had taken place; and accordingly demonstrated against the new management. Seven instructors out of a total of some 400 were dismissed, including the director of training.

There is nothing secretive whatever about this training program or the affiliation with it of the Central Intelligence Agency. Both have been discussed at length, in the press and on radio and television.

Ambassador Lodge and the U.S. mission council, in concert with their appropriate counterparts in the South Vietnamese Government, are studying intensively the entire rural development cadre program, including the best methods of assistance.

At this point, let me emphasize that the CIA has done nothing, and is doing nothing, except what it has been formally asked to do by the appropriate officials of he United States Government and the South Vietnamese Government.

In other words, the Times article is more than "confused." Much of it was untrue. The implied charge that the CIA was hoodwinked into sponsoring an anti-South Vietnamese Government "third force" movement does not square with the facts.

Major Mai is an active duty officer in the Vietnamese Army. He did preach a dynamic message of intense nationalism, and his relations with his Vietnamese colleagues and superiors have not been free of friction. But the charge that as a "result" of his activities the South Vietnamese Government was forced to "take over" the Vung Tau school from the CIA is totally inaccurate.

In this connection, the author of this article, Mr. Charles Mohr, appears either to have changed his position, or to be confused himself.

In this article that he wrote on July 18, Mr. Mohr states:

The change-over of the training program (from the Central Intelligence Agency to the South Vietnamese) took place in mid June.

And—

As a result, Saigon government officials have taken control from the Central Intelligence Agency of the program for training the "Revolutionary Development Cadre"—armed experts in political propaganda.

But 2 months earlier, in an article he also wrote for the New York Times as of May 21, and directly contrary to this his article of July 18, Mr. Mohr gave the facts as they actually are when he said:

The cadre training school at Vungtau, a coastal town near Saigon, lasted for 13 weeks. The school is run by the Vietnamese but is known to be financed by an American agency and has a number of American advisers.

In other words, if Mr. Mohr felt the school was being run by the Vietnamese in May, how can he now say that it was taken over by the Vietnamese from the CIA in June?

In a classified report made to the Senate upon my return to this country from the Far East earlier this year, I presented the details of a visit to Vung Tau with Major Mai—then captain—and others at the training school in question.

I ask unanimous consent that the declassified part of this Senate report on this school be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the declassified part of the Senate report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VUNG TAU, Monday, January 3.—The first thing this morning was a briefing at the U.S. Embassy. Then we flew to Vung Tau.

On the flight we were accompanied by Captain Le Xuan Mai, Director of the Vung Tau Farm.

On arrival we were taken to the Farm, where political action teams are trained. On arrival, Captain Mai first briefed us.

They take in natives, bringing in people who other people with whom they have contact say they know and trust. They operate on the coast where such a large part of the people live. The PAT are represented in each province.

The class they had going down there at this time had 3,200 people. The next class is programmed for 3,800 people. They train 40 man political action teams, equipped with three medics each. The class also included 150 girls who were being trained primarily as midwives. It was essentially a large "civic action" course. They tried to teach the students a strong spirit concerning what they were fighting for. Vietnam has been at war for 25 years.

Ever since the Japanese came, people had been influenced by Communist-Viet Cong propaganda. Most thought it was all right, customary to contribute to the Viet Cong. When many if not most come to Vung Tau Farm, they have a bad attitude; therefore, Captain Mai said they concentrated on orientations.

When they arrived, the students often used expressions like "American imperialists," along with "French colonialists." At Vung Tau these young ones were taught there are absolute enemies and relative enemies. China, for example, it was constantly stressed, is an absolute enemy.

The students were also taught that they had friends whose interests in South Vietnam were as dear as their own. Such were the United States, Korea, Australia, plus the other nations who were supporting the South Vietnamese.

Those North Vietnamese fighting for the Chinese Communists are absolute enemies, and those who are mistaken, and have joined the Viet Cong, are absolute enemies if they won't come back when they have the chance.

During phase I of the course, ———, Special stress is laid in creating confidence in the Vietnamese youth. The students are allowed, encouraged, to speak their minds fully about any problems there may be in the Vietnamese government, or anything else they may have on their minds. There is discussion of such problems as corruption, poverty, misery, and fatalism. They want them to talk about it, and they want to change it. They try to imbue them with a revolutionary spirit. Phase I is a three week intensive training period.

During phase II there is special emphasis on the importance of a strong will. They formerly made a fourteen kilometer march, everyday. Now that is reduced to eight kilometers a day. The student is asked if he is ready to accept hardship, and the life of a revolutionary. They have a ceremony incident to issuing the black suit. The student must wear it willingly. The black suit is the traditional peasant black pajamas. An individual, once he is a member of a political action team, stays on the payroll indefinitely.

During phase III they teach the student to accept the challenge of war. They teach him that he cannot stay around and do nothing, that much of the country is overrun by the Viet Cong, and that they cannot relax and put the whole future and destiny of the Republic of Vietnam in the hands of friends. They must do something for themselves.

In phase IV the students are taught how to fight, and urged to fight. They are taught the use of various arms and explosives; but the main weapon is political action, propaganda, how to help peasants fix houses, promote literacy, and care for the sick. They learn to send medics out to the sick, instead of asking the sick to come to the medics. Captain Mai observed they didn't need much medicine; usually a friendly word and an aspirin was very good propaganda.

During the course the students are given complete freedom to speak. In the beginning they generally resolutely criticize or accuse Americans, but then they are shown that they have no substantial basis for their arguments. They come to realize that the United States does not take from them, rather gives assistance. They are taught that if the Viet Cong are not present in the land, and the South Vietnamese can produce more rice, automatically there will be more wealth for all.

In teaching the students at Vung Tau Farm, the instructors go back deep in Vietnamese history, because the ancestors pass the spirit from one generation to another. They remind the students of the story of the fairy and the dragon. In this Vietnamese story, the fairy represents spirit, and the dragon represents matter. Materialism is only 50% of life. So the students should not follow the Marxist way of 100% materialism, rather it should be a 50–50 proposition. They also use other legends, such as the one about the three-year-old boy who became a young man when the aggressor struck. They show why the people must unite if they are to defend themselves.

At the Vung Tau Farm School there are seven steps in conducting a complete lesson.

First, there is individual study, in a five-man cell.

This is followed by a group lecture, at which the students take notes.

Third is a period when the students discuss the lesson among themselves, and elect a secretary to take notes.

The instructor then talks to the class, and corrects any mistakes, or mistaken ideas he feels they may have about the subject matter in question.

The fifth step is students themselves volunteer to address, and carry on the lesson with the class.

The sixth step is a summing up by the instructor of major points in the lesson.

The seventh step is the examination.

Each of the first six are two hour periods. The examination lasts one hour, so there are thirteen hours per lesson.

Throughout the course the instructors use the technique of instilling strong faith. They keep repeating and emphasizing that South Vietnam will be victorious.

There are five men in each cell of students. Eight cells go to make up a team. They teach parliamentary procedure and form a mock village government.

One half of their studies are in the school buildings, one half in the jungle. They set up defenses around villages, and defend against mock Viet Cong attacks.

Before bed each night the student makes a pledge to be loyal, to discipline himself,

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Mississippi Dairy Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, dramatic economic progress is being achieved in Mississippi through a bold industrialization program which has accelerated growth at an unprecedented rate. But agriculture—long the heart and soul of the State's economy—continues to play a vital role in this upsurge as our farmers work with renewed enthusiasm to build a better way of life for themselves and for their respective communities.

The flourishing Mississippi dairy industry is an example of a segment of agriculture which is adding momentum to our upsurge in prosperity. The spectacular progressive development in dairying in Mississippi is particularly significant at a time when the dairy industry is experiencing a sharp decline in many other sections of the Nation.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, Mississippi was the only Southern State which produced enough milk to fill the demands of its own residents. For a number of years now, our dairy farmers have exported about 40 percent of their grade A milk into adjoining States. The total production last year rose to more than a billion pounds of good quality milk and the industry, both directly and indirectly, is now contributing $130 million annually to the State's economy.

Dairy dollars are earned and spent in every county in Mississippi. Dairying generates employment. An estimated 25,000 people in Mississippi are primarily employed in producing, processing, manufacturing and selling dairying foods. They include about 8,000 dairy farmers, managers and employees of 25 pasteurizing plants, 4 butter and dry milk plants, 4 condenseries, 8 cheese plants, 22 ice cream manufacturing, and 380 retail ice cream establishments. In addition, many allied industries in Mississippi depend entirely or in part on dairying including dairy equipment dealers, manufacturers and dealers in feed, fertilizer, seed and general farm equipment, pesticides and building materials; dealers in petroleum products; transportation and other services.

The remarkable increase in both productivity and earnings in the past decade illustrate best the dynamic new significance of dairying in Mississippi. Last year, for instance, our grade A dairy farmers marketed 787 million pounds of milk—an increase of 36 percent in the 10-year span. Cash receipts in this category rose by 39 percent and producer milk exported increased by 22 percent in those years. In the past year alone production per cow increased 6.4 percent over 1964.

What has been responsible for this unique record of progress? Of course, favorable climate, temperature and natural resources have each hard a hand. But the real key to this progress is the improved management and techniques of Mississippi dairy farmers who are meeting the challenge of keeping pace with progress.

Walthall County in my congressional district is known as the "Cream Pitcher" of Mississippi because it produces more milk than any other county in the State. A recent edition of the Tylertown Times published in the county outlines the impact of the dairy industry in the area economy.

Here is the nutshell story from the Times:

Walthall County has a population of 13,512 people and 10,000 dairy cows. Dairying accounts for a whopping $4 million annually—or one-third of $12 million total. Dairying there has grown from a million-dollar industry in less than 25 years. The growth stands as a monument to farm and business leaders who worked hand in hand to improve the entire economic life of the county.

The exciting Walthall County story is typical of what is happening throughout the State. Mississippi will undoubtedly enjoy continued progress and the State's dairy industry will be a part of that growth as new production goals and income advances are achieved.

How Effective Is Our Blacklist of Ships Doing Business With Cuba and North Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in this year's minority views of the report of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966, we spoke of the number of free-world-flag ships that are transporting supplies and materials to North Vietnam. Chief among the offenders in this regard is Great Britain. Great Britain is also the leading offender among the free world nations in numbers of ships carrying goods to Fidel Castro.

The facts are that 36 free world ships called at North Vietnamese ports in the first quarter of 1966, 29 of which were British, and the further facts are that 67 free world ships, 26 of which were British, have visited Cuba during the same period.

This lends considerable credence to an article which recently appeared in Navy magazine for July 1966. The article points out that U.S. policy regarding this shipping problem is weak and ineffectual. It further points out that the British can and do prevent the shipping of other nations from aiding Rhodesia and in this venture we have cooperated with them. However, they have hardly lifted a finger to aid us in stopping aggression by Castro and Ho Chi Minh. I, therefore, commend this article to the attention of my colleagues.

HOW EFFECTIVE IS OUR BLACKLIST OF SHIPS DOING BUSINESS WITH CUBA AND NORTH VIET NAM?

(By Helen Delich Bentley, Maritime Editor, the Baltimore Sun)

While the United States' Ambassador to the United Nations fought vigorously for passage by the Security Council of the toughest economic sanctions ever voted by the U.N. in order to support Great Britain's stand against Rhodesia's defiant government, more British-flag ships were being added to America's blacklist for calling both at Cuba and North Viet Nam.

The addition of the British vessels to these blacklists—inaugurated by the United States against two countries it considers real enemies—is nothing unusual, because ships flying the Union Jack head both lists.

But it points up the ironic—almost ridiculous situation of the United States as far as international shipping is concerned.

Perhaps this was best illustrated in a cartoon printed recently in a Western newspaper. The drawing depicts a British navy captain on the bridge of his frigate looking through a telescope. On a nearby chart is marked a big "success" for having diverted a Greek-flag tanker bound for Mozambique to deliver oil to Rhodesia. Passing directly in front of the Navy vessel is a British-flag tanker laden with Soviet MIGS on its deck and oil in its holds with the words "North Viet Nam" emblazoned on its sides.

"This one can go because it is not heading to our enemy," remarked the British captain.

Ambassador Arthur Goldberg led a Security Council sit-in until the economic sanctions were voted. Those sanctions call for Britain "to employ all measures including armed force" to crush the Rhodesian regime of Premier Ian Smith. Rhodesia is a (former) colony of Great Britain in a continent somewhat removed from the United Kingdom.

Compare this series of moves to Great Britain's response when the United States called upon the countries of the Free World to stop their ships from going to Cuba, which had become Communist-dominated and armed with Russian missiles only 90 miles from the shores of the United States. Britain's Government accused this country of trying to control the seas and declared Uncle Sam was interfering with the freedom of the seas.

The United Kingdom stated it would not attempt to halt its shipowners from serving Cuba. It obviously has not, since more British ships are regularly being added to the blacklist. Of the 251 Free World and Polish vessels now on the official Cuban blacklist, 72 are British.

COULDN'T CARE LESS

But even more significant is the fact that British-flag ships have made 462 trips or nearly 45 per cent of the 1,157 voyages made to Cuba by Free World and Polish vessels since the United States inaugurated its blacklist on January 1, 1963.

Of the 10 ships on the North Viet Nam blacklist—which became effective as of January 25, 1966, months after the buildup in South Viet Nam was announced by President Johnson—seven are British. Great Britain has used the lame excuse that it cannot control the ships in Hong Kong. However, Greece did strip one of its tankers of its registry when it appeared in Beira with oil for Rhodesia.

When the United States protested Great Britain's sale of buses and other equipment to Cuba, the U.K. defied the protest and proceeded with the sale and shipment. Therefore, when it states that it cannot control the Hong Kong ships, there is a serious question whether Great Britain wants to.

Greece's stripping of the tanker's registry is another note of irony in the international shipping picture. Although the Greek Gov-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

ernment has issued Royal Decrees forbidding any of its ships to call at Cuba or North Viet Nam, Greek-flag vessels still are going to both countries. Some 35 of the ships on the Cuban blacklist belong to Greece, while two of the 10 going to North Viet Nam also are registered in that Mediterranean country.

'WORLD OPINION'

It would appear that the only reason the Greek government seized the registry of the *Joanna V* is because it had become an international issue with blazing headlines in every country in the world.

In January, the State Department reported that Free World ships trading with North Viet Nam had declinled from 34 per month in 1964 to 13 per month in the latter part of 1965. The blacklist became effective as of January 25, 1966, and the number may have declined even further, although no other figures have been issued.

However, it has been said on Capitol Hill that many of the ships transporting goods to North Viet Nam no longer are going directly there, but discharging their cargoes in Hong Kong for transshipment to the Communist country.

Thomas W. Gleason, president of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL–CIO), who has been working with United States Government officials to break the logjam in shipping in the Republic of Viet Nam ports, told the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee that he has viewed English, Panamanian, Greek and other ships in Hong Kong, "supposedly bringing in cargo for Hong Kong."

"But this stuff," he continued, "would be transferred into the small coastal vessels operated either by Chinamen or a few North Vietnamese or Crown Colony ships, and brought down into Haiphong for final discharge there."

Soviet Union ships also are running from Hong Kong to Haiphong, according to Lloyd's Weekly Shipping Index.

Although the United States' blacklist as such is considered weak and somewhat inconsequential in this country, there is a definite principle which our friends are defying. It is considered weak because the only thing the blacklist does is prevent the ships listed thereon from calling at United States ports to pick up Government-financed cargoes.

However, these blacklisted ships can:

1. Pick up commercial cargoes in American ports, if the longshoremen will load them.

2. Pick up United States Government-financed (through counterpart funds) cargoes in foreign ports.

And then, of course, when the owner feels that his trips to Cuba or North Viet Nam are not as remunerative as they might be if he picks up U.S. aid cargo in American ports, all he has to do is sign a pledge that he'll never send that ship again to that area. Ninety-one vessels—including 39 British and 25 Greek—have been freed from the Cuba blacklist in this manner.

The International Longshoremen's Association (AFL–CIO) succeeded in imposing a more stringent boycott of ships serving Cuba for two years after the Cuban crisis, but it has waned somewhat because of the difficulty in keeping track of the ships.

UNION SHOWS WAY

But the ILA refused to handle the ships of any owner who might have had even a single ship calling at Cuba. The union boycott went into effect three months before the U.C. government did anything officially.

Likewise in the case of North Viet Nam, the maritime unions began pressing to boycott or bar ships from the United States long before any official action was taken. Various Congressmen picked up their complaints and introduced legislation which would do everything from preventing such ships from ever calling at the United States again to stopping any ship from any country which had a single vessel going to North Viet Nam from calling in an American port. These bills are languishing on Capitol Hill and probably will never see daylight.

Even when Congress passed an amendment to the foreign aid bill that prevented doling out any money to any nation whose ships were calling at Cuba, the Executive Department chose to ignore that order.

When the State Department first decided to lift the blacklist from the ships of owners who "took the pledge" not to send the ship into Cuba again (a similar pledge is available in the instance of North Viet Nam), the longshoremen refused to go along and clear these ships.

The test case was the SS *Tulse Hills*, an American-built liberty sold after the war to help rehabilitate the Greek merchant marine and subsequently switched to British registry by the Mavroleon Kulukundis interests when they headquartered in London.

The *Tulse Hills* arrived in Baltimore shortly after the agreement was signed between Basil Mavroleon—whose combine had the most ships in the Cuban trade—and the State Department. Baltimore longshoremen—all members of the International Longshoremen's Association (AFL–CIO)—refused to load the grain aboard the vessel. The owners took the dockworkers to court and went up through the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals, which concurred that no force could make an individual load a particular vessel or do a special job if he did not want to.

After 137 days of waiting the *Tulse Hills* departed from Baltimore without any fanfare and without its cargo. The dockworkers again proved that their "blacklist" was more potent than the Government's.

In addition to the Greek and British ships on the Cuba blacklist, there are 57 Lebanese, 18 Polish, 18 Cypriot, 14 Italian, 9 Yugoslav, 7 French, 5 Moroccan, 5 Maltese, 4 Finnish, 2 Dutch, 2 Norwegian, 2 Swedish, and one from Monaco.

A number of these have since changed their register by the same owner or been sold to another owner and registered in another country. However, their new identity also is carried on the blacklist published regularly by the Maritime Administration. As a result, the current list includes such countries as South Africa, Panama, Guinea, Haiti, Liberia and Nationalist China.

MANY ARE U.S.-BUILT

There are many ironies in this blacklist-boycott picture. For instance, a substantial portion of the ships on the list are former Liberty vessels built in the United States during World War II and sold to the friendly nations at a cheap price to help them get their merchant marines going after the war. Both Panama and Liberia issued proclamations that no ships in their registry could serve Cuba and yet six have been transferred to those countries and now are appearing on the list.

A number of the ships registered in both Lebanon and Cyprus are owned by Greeks who are somewhat concerned that their own nation might seize their registries, so they charged over first. Lebanon and Cyprus can both be considered "flags of convenience," along with Panama, Liberia, and Honduras, for shipowners, although it is believed that no American shipowners have transferred any vessels to the Middle East area.

Some American shipping circles have expressed grave concern over the fact that the Security Council upheld London's position on the Rhodesian boycott so strongly. They note that morality of Britain's dispute with Rhodesia is one thing, but the morality of the kind of blockade-enforced boycott is another.

What would Great Britain's reaction be, they ask, if the United States should seek a similar boycott against both Cuba and North Viet Nam—a country with which American troops are at war and losing their lives?

DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

It also is noted that perhaps a dangerous precedent has been set and they ask what would happen if the situation should be reversed: A Communist-oriented power decided to apply heavy pressure on a neighbor friendly to the West, declares a boycott and then goes not to the Security Council but to the General Assembly of the United Nations for approval of stronger measures, including a blockade. The conclusion is that western maritime nations may find themselves in a most embarrasing position.

And the big question is whether Great Britain, with one of the largest mercantile fleets afloat, would defy that blockade in the same manner it has the blacklists of the United States?

Rees Announces Results of 1966 Questionnaire to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, this May I sent to my constituents in California's 26th Congressional District my annual congressional questionnaire. The response was immediate and enthusiastic, and I would like to thank the more than 12,000 citizens who were sufficiently concerned to take the time to complete and return this poll.

My congressional district is in the western section of Los Angeles County and includes the cities of Beverly Hills and Culver City; the Los Angeles City communities of Rancho Park, Venice, Mar Vista, Westdale, West Los Angeles, Cheviot Hills, Beverlywood, West Adams, and Fairfax Avenue; as well as the Los Angeles County areas of Marina del Rey, West Hollywood, and the Sunset Strip. Incomes range from lower middle to upper; a majority of my constituents are homeowners, and their educational level is higher than average.

The questions were written to reflect issues of particular concern to my district, as well as the current major national and international issues. In the multiple-choice questions many respondents chose several alternatives. Because of this some percentages add up to more than 100 percent. Also particularly gratifying was the high degree of respondents who further elaborated their views with notes and letters. I regret that space limitations make it impossible for me to share these comments with my colleagues as, having read them, I can testify to the worthwhile nature of the overwhelming majority of the statements.

Knowing that my colleagues in Congress will be interested in the response of my constituents to the vital issues of the day, I include here the tabulated results of this poll:

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

continental rates. This measure has not yet been acted upon by the full Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Although it was encouraging to see the public law signed and it was heartening to see the House pass the latter measure, neither goes far enough in terms of giving servicemen the maximum opportunities to receive mail.

I received a letter from a constituent in South River, N.J., who told me:

I am thinking of older people who depend on social security for their only income. For people in this category and people on relief it would sometimes almost be impossible to send even a small package to Vietnam.

Why must it be so costly to send a small box of hope, love and a bit of home to the GI's who are so bravely sacrificing their lives for our country.

Now, it may cost up to $4.08 to send a 5-pound parcel air mail from New York to San Francisco, the point of embarkation for Asian mail. To many families, this may prove to be a heavy financial burden.

Here is a situation where some 300,000 soldiers are engaged in a fight for their very lives—the least we at home could do would be to insure these men some small measure of the comforts of home. It is unfair both to the members of the Armed Forces and their parents who may be prohibited by costs from sending them news from home or small packages.

It is bad for morale as well. In a communication to Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien, the President has said:

Mail is the vital link that bridges vast distances, bringing warmth and news and, most important, easing the pain of separation. To have mail delivered sooner is to bring home that much closer.

It goes without saying that, to paraphrase the President, to have mail delivered more often is also to bring home that much closer.

It is a well-known fact that mail call is one of the few bright spots of the day of a soldier in combat. If we in Washington can make this moment a bit happier, then, I think that we can say that we are doing our part.

What is more, this bill will not be a burden on the taxpayers. I have been informed by Mr. Eugene B. Crowe, Acting Assistant Postmaster General of the Post Office Department, that revenue loss on first-class letters and small parcels going to Vietnam—based on a survey made at the San Francisco Post Office—terminal for all U.S. mail going to Vietnam—will be only $1.6 million. Although $1.6 million is not a figure which one usually precedes with "only," we must put the cost in the proper perspective of the entire war. Although official figures are not available, it is likely that we are spending $20 billion a year or more in Vietnam. In comparison to that figure, $1.6 million is but a minute fraction.

Eric Sevareid has pointed out that it costs about $1 million for each member of the Vietcong that American forces kill in action. This additional cost of $133,000 a month will not be great at all.

In addition, we have set precedents in past wars of giving soldiers mailing privileges home. Now, I feel that an extra measure is necessary so that soldiers are not faced with the problem which was reported by Mrs. Walter Glynn, national president of the American Legion Auxiliary:

A serviceman in Da Nang portrayed the plight of those who receive little mail when he wrote "Although I would like a hometown newspaper, I have a friend who needs one more than I do. He does not receive much mail; in fact, if he receives a letter once every two weeks, he's lucky. Some time ago he told me that if he had his hometown newspaper, he would not miss mail so much.

Certainly, if there is any body of American citizens which ought to receive special compensation from the Government, it is those soldiers serving in combat areas. I believe that my bill, H.R. 16389, by giving these men the added "bonus" pleasure of hearing from loved ones and friends, would help provide a needed and vital service for our men in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for speedy and positive action on my legislation.

California Loses a Distinguished Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Golden State of California lost one of its most distinguished citizens who was a conservationist of world renown.

During his 91 years, Dr. Charles M. Goethe played a major role in the development of our national park system and also in the fostering of recreation areas not only in this country but in many areas throughout the world with especial emphasis on areas attractive to our children.

Early in my career of public service I was privileged to become acquainted with this outstanding man who, I should point out, was born at Lake Tahoe at a time when this world-famed recreation spot was still known only to the hardiest of pioneers. In my own association with Dr. Goethe, I was honored to work with him toward the development of the American River, including the construction of the Folsom Dam and Reservoir, the conservation projects on Middle Fork, and the developments on the South Fork constructed by the Sacramento Municipal Utilities District, and, finally, with the Auburn Dam project which was authorized by this Congress just in the last year.

Paying tribute to this distinguished citizen of California, the Sacramento Bee, which serves most of northern California, published an outstanding editorial. It is my pleasure to include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

Sacramento has lost one of its most distinguished and honored citizens in the death of Charles M. Goethe.

And while he was a native of this city it also can be said of him that in a very real sense he was a citizen of the world, so wide ranging were his interests and so diversified the activities to which he devoted his time and a goodly portion of his fortune as well.

In business, he was most successful. And to those who knew him best it appeared he coveted material success not so much for its intrinsic value but because it provided him with the means and the leisure to promote the philanthropic, conservation and religious causes which were closest to his heart.

To enumerate these would take an article encyclopedic in length.

Typical of them were such activities as the establishment of the ranger naturalist service in our country's national parks, the fostering of the kindergarten movement, the establishment of children's playgrounds not only in the United States but in many foreign countries as well, the saving of the redwoods for the enjoyment of generations yet to come, the promotion of the junior museums, the establishment of the Everglades National Park in Florida which resulted in the salvation of the egrets.

A naturalist, he was the Audubon of his time as the nature series he long has contributed to The Bee gives wide and varied illustration.

And he richly deserved the rare distinction for an American of being elected to a fellow of the British Royal Arts Society.

Goethe and his wife, Mary Glide Goethe, for many years spent six months of each year in travel primarily to learn about the flora and fauna and peoples of distant lands. His knowledge of these was both varied and intimate. They were a constant wonder to those who talked with him. He had a passion for knowing and understanding.

Yet he himself was not always understood, for his ways of helping others with finances, with kindness, were known only to a few. But the scope of the material aid he passed along monthly, especially to young people and to groups working with or for young people, was so very wide, the total sum of his assistance had to be large.

Scholarships, vacations, blocks of tickets for the children's theater—the list of his gratuities was very long indeed, still the donor always remained modestly in the background.

Goethe's life was one fruitful and rich in human satisfactions far beyond the usual.

And it can be said with truthfulness that the world was made a happier and better place because he walked this way.

He may be gone but the good he did will continue to endure as long as little children romp in playgrounds and as long as people gather around campfires to listen with eager minds to rangers relating to them the wonders of the great out of doors.

The Coast Guard in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, for a year, Squadron 1 of the U.S. Coast Guard has been prowling the coastal waters of Vietnam charged with sharing the responsibility of halting the movement by water of men and supplies from North Vietnam to Vietcong units in the south. In order that the contribution of the Coast Guard to the war effort may be more fully understood and appreciated, I include in today's RECORD, H. R. Kaplan's article "The Coast Guard in

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Vietnam," from the June 1966 edition of Navy magazine:

THE COAST GUARD IN VIETNAM

(By H. R. Kaplan)

Half way around the world, in the South China Sea, the United States Coast Guard's Squadron One is keeping watch over the sea approaches to the embattled Republic of Viet Nam. Its mission is to bar movement by water of men and materials from North Viet Nam to Viet Cong units in the south. It's an objective more easily stated than accomplished.

Squadron One has been in Viet Nam waters since last July, when the first units arrived via the Philippines. Operating under the direction of the United States Navy, the Squadron's twenty-six 82-foot patrol boats, together with Navy units and naval craft of the Republic of Viet Nam, make up the Coastal Surveillance Force. The Force is a major part of the sea war being waged by the United States and its allies to prevent a Communist take-over.

Day and night, seven days a week, units of the small Coast Guard fleet prowl the seemingly placid coastal waters of Viet Nam on the lookout for infiltration from the sea. The land they guard is, in many ways, a beautiful one, with dazzling white beaches, lofty mountains and green valleys. But it is a land scarred by war. Its dense forests and jungles conceal Viet Cong soldiers. Its people are terrorized by marauding Communist guerrillas.

Like other servicemen in Viet Nam, the men of Squadron One must endure the loneliness of being in a distant part of the world, far removed from our own in customs, language and tradition. There is also the intense heat, ranging from 90 to 120 degrees, high humidity and the drenching seasonal rains that make life difficult.

In the 11 months the men of Squadron One have been at their job, they have become veterans. They've learned that war in Viet Nam is a hard, grinding, unglamorous affair, filled with unpleasant surprises. That innocent looking junk can suddenly become a blazing instrument of death. Those mild looking fishermen may be Viet Cong soldiers armed with grenades and other weapons. So the one rule you keep uppermost in your mind is: Don't relax. It could mean your life.

The patrol function carried out by the Squadron has the intriguing title, "Operation Market Time". It's a curiously peaceful name for so dangerous a mission. No one knows exactly how it received its name, but one theory is that it was derived from the thousands of commercial junks plying these waters daily. In this part of the world, where refrigeration facilities are virtually nonexistent, the junks serve as floating markets. These marine markets have sometimes provided the Viet Cong with opportunities for smuggling men and supplies into battle zones.

THE VUNG RO CAPER

What finally brought the matter of sea infiltration to a head was the discovery in February, 1965, of a large arms cache in Vung Ro Bay by members of the U.S. and Vietnamese navies. A 130-foot camouflaged junk had been sighted by a helicopter while on a medical mission out of Qui Nhon. Aircraft were called to the scene and four air strikes sank the vessel in shallow water.

Afterwards, investigators found that she was carrying enough supplies to outfit an entire Viet Cong battalion. Her armament was sufficient to knock out any normal-size patrol vessel. From caches on the beach nearby, investigators recovered 1,500 weapons and 30 tons of ammunition, explosives and medical supplies. Most of the equipment was of Red Chinese manufacture. Papers found on the ship clearly showed that it was of North Vietnamese registry and engaged in infiltration.

This episode and several others like it convinced the Navy that something had to be done quickly to halt further infiltration. But Viet Nam's highly indented coastline made it very vulnerable to incursions from the sea. Faced with this problem, the Navy turned to the Coast Guard for assistance. The Navy Command knew that the Coast Guard's fast, highly maneuverable 82-foot patrol craft were ideally suited to the operation. Accordingly, they requested that vessels of this type be made available for close in-shore patrol work along the coast of the Republic of Viet Nam.

The Coast Guard responded by ordering 17 of its 82-footers to Viet Nam duty. On May 26, 1965, at Alameda, California, this force was commissioned as Coast Guard Squadron One. It was an excellent demonstration of the close working partnership that has existed between the two Services throughout our country's history. It is a partnership which has been confirmed many times on the beaches of Guadalcanal, Normandy, Sicily, North Africa and many other places far from the American homeland.

But before the Coast Guard vessels could be sent to the theater of operations, they had to be fitted out with additional armament. This included four 50-caliber machine guns and, as a main battery, a 50-caliber machine gun ingeniously moutned "piggy back" fashion on an 81-millimeter mortar. The mounting was devised by Chief Warrant Gunner Elmer Hicks. Obviously, Coast Guard personnel have not lost their ability to improvise.

Merchant ships carried the 82-footers to Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, which was the shakedown and staging area for the operation. Here the cutters and their crews were paired off for the first time. In the months ahead they would get to know a lot about one another. Each cutter was to carry an 11-man crew and a Vietnamese interpreter.

Before leaving for Viet Nam, Squadron One was split into Divisions 11 and 12. The nine cutters of Division 11 were to operate out of An Thoi on the island of Phu Quoc in the South to seal off the Viet Nam-Cambodian border and to patrol the Viet Nam coast on the Gulf of Thailand. Division 12's eight cutters were to be based at Da Nang and its area of activity was to be near the northern sector of the Republic of Viet Nam just south of the 17th parallel, the border between South Viet Nam and the Communist North. In February, 1966, an additional nine vessels were dispatched to the Squadron, bringing the total to 26. The new unit, Division 13, operates along Viet Nam's central coast and is based at Vung Tau (Cat Lo), about 40 miles south of Saigon.

The stretch of coast patrolled by the Coastal Surveillance Force, of which the Squadron is a part, totals about 750 miles, roughly comparable to the coast of California. That's a lot of water for a small fleet to cover. Working with it are ships and aircraft of the U.S. Navy and naval units of the Republic of Viet Nam.

A TYPICAL DAY

In command of Squadron One is Captain Robert LoForte whose headquarters are in Saigon. His command is composed of about 400 men, including relief crews, maintenance personnel, medical corpsmen and the headquarters staff. He serves directly under the Commander, Naval Forces, Viet Nam, who controls the operations of the entire Coastal Surveillance Force.

What's a typical day on patrol? As a rule it's pretty strenuous. Once a suspicious looking junk is sighted, the cutter heads for it. Boardings are business-like, but courteous. Most of the interrogation is conducted by the Vietnamese officer who checks the junk's registry and the crews' credentials. Inspectors are fully aware of the importance of establishing good relations with the civilian population. Many of the people on the junks are well known to the inspectors through previous boardings. Food packages, medicine, cigarettes and other gift items are distributed. Last Christmas, Squadron One distributed gifts to fishermen and dependent children of personnel of the Vietnamese Navy.

Squadron One's war may not have the heart-quickening tension of the war in the rice paddies and the jungles, but it has some built-in dangers of its own. Take for example the case of the *Point Marone* in Division 11 in the Gulf of Thailand. For more than a month the cutter had been on patrol without incident. To her skipper, Lieutenant David R. Markey of Groton, Conn., it looked very much as though he were never going to see any action in this strange war.

All that changed on August 23, 1965. While patrolling the northern end of Phu Quoc island, Markey spotted a junk headed for Cambodian waters. There was something about her that put Markey on his guard. He ordered pursuit of the craft, overtaking it. The three men on board were taken prisoner and turned over to Vietnamese naval authorities. Later they confessed that they were members of the Viet Cong.

CAPTURE FIRST JUNK

Two days later, on August 25, the cutters *Point Mast, Point Comfort,* and *Point Clear* and a Navy destroyer escort shelled a Viet Cong staging area not far from the Vietnamese Navy Junk Base at An Thoi. Using their 81-millimeter mortars, firing high explosive rounds, they saturated the target area.

On September 19, 1965, the tempo of war really speeded up for Division 11. On that day, a Sunday, *Point Glover* made the first capture of a Viet Cong junk, attempting to infiltrate via the Gulf of Thailand. The action started at 1 a.m. when the cutter detected an unlighted junk in the area and started to close in. At first the junk attempted evasive action. The cutter stopped the junk by smashing her engine with machine gun fire. A boarding party found rifles, including Chinese Communist carbines, 480 rounds of ammunition, cargo and personal effects. One survivor was found by the *Point Garnet,* the other crewmen of the junk were presumed drowned.

On the same hectic Sunday at 11:30 p.m. the *Point Marone* sighted another junk trying to reach the Viet Nam coast on the Gulf of Thailand. The *Marone* fired two warning shots as the junk tried to evade and outmaneuver the cutter. The *Marone's* fire was answered by Communist small arms and grenades. Then the cutter let go with her bow machine gun. During the fight, the *Point Glover* arrived on the scene and illuminated the area with her mortar, providing supporting small arms and machine gun fire. Riddled with bullets, the junk sank soon after it was taken in tow by the *Point Glover.* In the action, 11 Viet Cong were killed. One badly wounded survivor was taken ashore near a U.S. Special Forces Camp at the village of Ha Tien on the mainland. None of the cutters sustained damage.

On the following day, the *Point Young* carried a salvage party to the scene from Division 11's support ship, U.S.S. *Krishna.* From the second junk, the Coast Guard recovered six rifles, ammunition, hand grenades, a large amount of Vietnamese money and documents, confirming that its crew were Viet Cong.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

RAMMING ENEMY JUNK

Frequently, the cutters provide gunfire support for ground forces in danger of being overrun by the enemy, assist Viet Nam naval units engaged by the enemy forces, and shell enemy shore installations.

Squadron One racked up another score against the enemy on the evening of March 9, 1966. At 10:15 p.m., the *Point White* of Division 13 spotted a 25-foot motorized junk attempting to cross the Soirap River from the mangrove swamp area designated as the Rung Sat Special Zone. The cutter hailed the junk at a distance of about 150 yards, simultaneously illuminating the area. A savage burst of automatic and small arms fire was the junk's answer. The enemy fire was immediately returned by *Point White's* small arms and 50-caliber machine guns.

The cutter's reply disabled several of the enemy and tore big chunks out of the junk's hull. But the Viet Cong were stubborn and a hail of bullets continued to pour out of the junk. In the face of the continuing fire. *Point White's* skipper, Lieutenant Eugene J. Hickey, ordered full speed ahead to ram the junk. He hit the junk amidships. Within 30 minutes after the ramming, she went down. A fanatical Viet Cong in the forward section kept firing until the vessel sank. Because of his resistance, only four crewmen of the junk were rescued.

On March 19, 1966, *Point Garnet* provided covering fire to permit the withdrawal of a U.S. Special Forces team which had run into an enemy ambush on Phu Quoc island. Because of the *Garnet's* action, the force escaped intact.

NORMALLY STRENUOUS

As these incidents indicate, Squadron One's job is anything but routine. So far, the cutters of Division 12 at Da Nang have been involved in much more offshore work than those of Division 11. But whatever their job, all the men of the Squadron must remain on continual alert and be able to respond instantly to any situation. Even without the outright challenge of the enemy, their normal patrol duty is taxing enough. By the end of December, 1965, the original 17 cutters had inspected nearly 12,500 junks and boarded 9,741. Since then, these totals have gone up tremendously.

Squadron One's divisions work closely with local junk divisions in their patrols, exchanging information and taking frequent occasion to compare notes on suspicious areas, such as approaches to rivers and canals where traffic appears to be heavier than usual. In contrast to peacetime patrols, the Squadron's ships spend more than 70 per cent of their time on patrol. This is well over twice the time underway for similar ships in peacetime. But nobody is complaining and morale is high.

Coast Guardsmen in Viet Nam do have several things going for them. Their ships are airconditioned and the food is up to the usual high Coast Guard standards. Whenever possible, the men are given liberty to rest at recreational facilities at Ha Tien, Vung Tau, and occasionally at Hongkong, Bangkok and other areas. This doesn't happen very often, however. On the relatively rare occasions they go ashore, they are well received by the native population, especially the children to whom Americans are "Okay, Number 1", the highest oriental rating. No. 10 represents the other end of the popularity scale.

Squadron One, of course, is only a small part of the complex and difficult operation now being carried out in Viet Nam. Nevertheless it is an important one. Its men know that a great deal depends on the skill and dedication which they bring to their work.

H.R. 13419

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 18, 1966

(Mr. ROGERS of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the full committee [Mr. ASPINALL] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] have rather fully explained the purposes and need for this legislation. I want to reemphasize the fact that we have this legislation before us today because of the desire of the legislative committees to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation with respect to feasibility grade investigations and the preparation of feasibility reports. In other words, this bill implements the limiting provision adopted by the Congress last year when we passed the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. Up until now, since 1902, the Bureau has had general authority to conduct these studies. From now on, each feasibility investigation must be specifically authorized.

The reason for the great number of studies listed in this bill is because this is the first legislation considered since enactment of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. Thus, this bill must provide authority to continue all the investigations underway at the present time, including even those that have been completed where the projects have not been authorized for construction by the Congress. In the future, the Congress will need to authorize only the new planning starts.

The restriction on the Bureau's general authority, approved by the Congress last year, permits the legislative committees to examine these proposed projects at an earlier stage in the planning procedure and to exercise better control over the program. Past experience has shown that, once a project study reaches the feasibility stage, the impression prevails among the people in the local project areas that congressional authorization is pretty much a routine matter and foregone conclusion.

The local people and the local sponsoring groups are usually surprised to learn of possible delays in authorization. They cannot understand why the projects should not immediately be authorized once the feasibility report has been completed. They are unaware of the problem of imbalance between the Bureau of Reclamation's planning program and construction program, and that all of the projects with completed feasibility reports cannot be authorized because of budget ceilings.

Under the new procedure, it will be possible for Members of Congress to be familiar with the studies that are being conducted, and they will not be suddenly confronted with a completed projects report and local pressure for immediate authorization.

Mr. Speaker, as has already been pointed out, the investigations authorized in this legislation will be conducted over a period of at least the next 10 years. These investigations will result in a flow of completed feasibility reports to the Congress and will provide all of the information necessary for Congress to approve those projects that are meritorious and needed. The enactment of this legislation will permit orderly development of plans to meet the ever-growing water problems and needs of the Western United States.

I urge the approval of this legislation.

Happy Half Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I ask our colleagues to join in congratulating Sanford H. Wendover, editor of the Meriden, Conn., Journal, on the completion of his 50th year with the Journal. There is something unique and commendable in the completion of half a century of service with a single employer, but when this service is recognized as eloquent and essential in the public domain it becomes all the more admirable and deserving of commendation.

Editor Wendover was pleasantly surprised by his associates with a 50th anniversary party, complete with cake, candles, flowers, and telegrams and messages from friends and associates from throughout the State and in other parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Editor Wendover's dedication to the task of protecting the community by enlightening the individual, I wish to include here the text of a letter which was addressed to Mr. Wendover by William L. Plante, Jr., president of the New England Society of Newspaper Editors, and a resolution introduced by Alderman Albert Hyman and adopted unanimously by the Court of Common Council of the City of Meriden:

The letter from Mr. Plante is as follows:

The officers and the governors of the New England Society of Newspaper Editors congratulate you upon your 50 years of service to journalism in New England.

Years alone do not tell the story. Your hard work, your professional competence, your talents as writer and editor, and your role as community leader set a mark for the rest of us to emulate.

The society is proud to number you among its earliest members. It extends to you greetings and best wishes for continuing

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

good health at this significant point in your career.

The resolution is as follows:

This is probably one of the most unusual resolutions our body will be acting upon because it contains no 'whereases and now therefores.'

The reason is because the man to whom we are paying tribute is one who just won't tolerate the redundancies of our governmental language.

It's not unique in this day and age for a man to be doing the same job for 50 years, but when that job is serving as a responsible critic and conscience to a city it behooves us all to take a brief moment to say thank you.

For his 50 years—celebrated today—as one of the pioneer developers and later leading voice of the Meriden Journal and for his many other years of public service, including terms on the Board of Apportionment and Taxation, this council takes this occasion to say thank you to Sanford H. Wendover, editor, Meriden Journal.

Dr. Teruo Ihara: Add New Dimension to International Understanding by Increasing Grants To "Have Not" Foreign Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, our Government's foreign scholarship program, established by the Congress in 1946, continues to be one of America's most important efforts toward promoting international understanding. And yet, Asia, which is recognized as an acute area in which the United States ought to promote understanding, receives only 4 percent of the total Fulbright scholarships. Western Europe, on the other hand, enjoys approximately 80 percent of the educational exchanges.

Dr. Teruo Ihara, associate professor of education at the University of Hawaii, says that this imbalance in geographic distribution is largely caused by the requirement for fluency in English. He adds that this language requirement has also tended to limit the grantees to those who come from the upper socio-economic level of their country. Dr. Ihara offers some helpful suggestions as to how the selective process might be improved.

Fortunately, Dr. Ihara, who happens to be a personal friend of mine, was recently appointed to the State Department's 12-member Board of Foreign Scholarships, and we will have the benefits of his views.

The newspaper article, written by Judy Chase, summarizing Dr. Ihara's views appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of June 30, 1966. I now submit the article for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, June 30, 1966]

MORE GRANTS URGED FOR "HAVE-NOT" FOREIGN STUDENTS

(By Judy Chase)

The United States should concern itself more with ferreting out the "have-not" youngsters of developing foreign countries for student grants, Dr. Teruo Ihara believes.

Ihara, associate professor of education at the University of Hawaii was recently appointed by President Johnson to the U.S. State Department's 12-member Board of Foreign Scholarships.

He said, "we can't get through to these people with handouts.

"The Red Chinese are getting through to them via their minds. We should approach them in the same way."

Ihara was critical of the fact that most Fulbright grants awarded by the board to foreigners go to students who are better off than average socially and economically.

He said the same is true of East-West Center grantees from foreign countries. "All this does is maintain the status quo."

KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH

The reason foreign students selected are so homogenous is that selection depends heavily on proficiency in English, Ihara said. The only people who are able to learn English are in the higher socio-economic brackets.

Yet, to keep pace in American graduate schools, he said, any student has to be fluent in English. (All Fulbright grantees are either graduates students, researchers or lecturers.)

Ihara said to solve this dilemma in educational and cultural interchange, he advocates that an intensive English training program be started making all bright foreigners eligible.

The Board of Foreign Scholarships is a blue-ribbon panel including Chairman Oscar Handlin, Warren professor of American history at Harvard; John M. Stalnaker, president of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation; Francis Keppel, assistant secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for education; Brooks Hays, former U.S. congressman from Arkansas, and Arthur Vanderbilt, professor of political affairs at Rutgers University.

Though the board sets the State Department's educational exchange policy and stamps final approval on all Fulbright grants, bi-national commissions recommend the students from foreign countries.

Where none exists, the U.S. embassy's cultural affairs officer makes the recommendations.

CHANGE IN PROCESS

Ihara feels the selection process might be improved by awarding grants to institutions rather than individuals, so that foreign students will be more likely to return home to jobs or studies after their stay in the U.S. than they are now.

"Remaining in the states is a problem which the board recognizes and is seeking to solve, though, of course, it depends on the individual country."

For example, "just about all students who come here from Thailand go back, while Korea has not been as fortunate," he said. Also, "I know many Pakistanis who would dearly love to get out of their country."

Ihara feels, too, that giving the Fulbright grants to institutions both in the U.S. and abroad "would ensure the maximum benefit to all concerned."

AMERICAN STUDENTS

Selection of American students now is based primarily on scholastic achievement and their proposals to tie in a study grant with their own educational experiences and goals.

Preliminary screening is done by the Institute for International Education and the Conference Board.

Though the board puts education before politics, Ihara said, "Sometimes we have to turn students down because the State Department is concerned that on the basis of their past actions in this country, their actions abroad might not be in the best interests of the United States."

Ihara added that the board has a policy under which no explanation is given to a student as to why he has been turned down. He said the reason is that "the large number of students involved makes it impossible."

Personally, Ihara said, "I think it is in the best interest of the United States to have completely free interchange of ideas between the U.S. and foreign countries.

"I think it would be great if we could arrange educational exchanges with Red China, Russia and Indonesia, but these countries are unwilling."

He said the U.S. does have student exchanges with Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia and that Burma and Ceylon recently expressed interest in joining the Fulbright program.

The student exchange program adopted by Congress in 1946 was intended to be a new dimension in international understanding. Despite its shortcomings, Ihara said, "testimonies by return grantees are generally in agreement that increased understanding of Americans has been one of its most important results. And this dispelling of ugly stereotypes about the American people is very important."

Ihara, who has attended two of the board's four annual meetings in Washington since his appointment, said he has several recommendations he plans to make in the future.

As a member of the Far Eastern Committee, he said he will work toward more educational and cultural exchanges with Asia.

"Right now, about 80 percent of the exchanges are with Western Europe, and only four percent with the Far East.

"The Viet Nam and Red China situations being what they are, I think that the next great area of world conflict will be Southeast Asia. If we can help these people to develop their capabilities to carry on viable ongoing societies, it will add to their desire for freedom."

Ihara said he would also like to see more Fulbright grants go to teachers. "Since teachers are the ones who mold the thinking of our children, the benefits of their grants would be multiplied."

Overregulation Can Kill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 20, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, in the present issue of American Heritage, there is a very profound article on the regulating of the natural wildlife in our Nation, which stresses the theme that by regulating many of the species of animal life, we are seriously tampering with nature's balance.

In effect, by meeting our problems with short-range solutions, we are multiplying our problems for the future.

In line with the thoughts expressed in American Heritage is an editorial from the Claiborne County, Tenn., Progress, which I insert in the RECORD, stressing its conclusion that—

Pesticides and their proper use are the difference between abundance and scarcity.

The editorial follows:

OVERREGULATION CAN KILL

Population increases bring inescapable environment changes. Dr. Warren C. Shaw, a top official of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, says that the world's population of humans, domestic animals and wildlife could

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Summary of Government aids to maritime industries

Country	Direct		Indirect			
	Operating subsidy	Construction subsidy	Tax benefits	Depreciation	Loans and interest on loans	Other
Denmark				X	X [1]	X.
France	X	X		X	X	X.
West Germany			X	X [2]	X	X.
Greece			X			X.
Italy	X	X	X	X [2]	X	X.
Japan	X	X	X [2]	X	X	X.
Netherlands				X [2]	X	X.
Norway	X [1]		X [2]	X	X	X.
Sweden	X [1]	X [1]	X	X	X	X.
United Kingdom	X [1]		X [2]	X	X	X.
United States	X	X	X	X	X	X.

[1] Domestic only.
[2] Not exclusively to shipping.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the war in Vietnam is rapidly degenerating to the point where brutal reprisal encourages brutal reprisal, and neither side will any longer be in complete control of its own actions.

The aggressor Government of North Vietnam has threatened to escalate hostilities by brutality and threats against captured American airmen, contrary to all international agreements. At the same time, the righteous anger of the American people may well demand retaliation beyond the design of our policymakers in Washington.

And once again, civilization will have retrogressed to the level of "an eye for an eye—a tooth for a tooth."

All Americans pray that U.S. leadership will be able to bring about the termination of hostilities in Vietnam, at the earliest possible date. I believe that our citizens, as well as most of the free world, look to Washington to supply the kind of initiative, both military and diplomatic, that will rule out reprisal, and rule in a peace settlement.

Unfortunately such initiative has too often been lacking. Unfortunately the Pentagon and the State Department too often react to crises and opportunities rather than showing the initiative that might bring about an early peace in Asia.

For instance, many of us urged the administration months ago to strike at strictly military targets near Hanoi and Haiphong in order to blunt increasing aggression in South Vietnam, and to persuade North Vietnam to negotiate. If the objective is to save lives and to end the conflict, why were such actions wrong in January but right in July?

Last January, the administration appealed to the United Nations to play a role toward a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war, and sent its representatives to the four corners of the earth in order to establish a broad basis for peace negotiations. If new initiatives toward negotiated settlement of the Vietnam war were worth trying then, is it not now more important than ever before that the United States exhaust every possibility in the pursuit of an early and meaningful peace?

While I advocated increased air strikes at military targets in January, and I support those actions taken on June 29, there is a mounting danger today that continued military acceleration without an equal acceleration of peace-seeking efforts may well result in the eventual negotiations over a wasteland. If the present situation continues, we may win a military victory—but what will we have won?

Hanoi has made it patently clear that direct negotiations with the United States, at this time, are out of the question. But recent developments in Asia offer a timely opportunity to investigate a new approach to a Vietnamese settlement, one that may overcome Hanoi's objections to direct U.S. involvement, and yet an approach that would guarantee consideration of U.S. interests.

The newly organized Asia and Pacific Council—South Korea, Philippines, Thailand, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Republic of China, Malasia, South Vietnam, Laos-observer—might well be the instrument through which a new and aggressive peace offensive could be launched. On July 2, Charles H. Percy, Republican senatorial candidate in Illinois, suggested that an Asian attempt at reaching a settlement of the Vietnam conflict might be a valuable addition to the diplomatic arsenal that has so far been unable to breach the wall of Hanoi's obstinance.

In short, I have long objected to a military policy of trying to stem aggression with one arm tied behind our back. At the same time, I am deeply concerned that we are permitting a similar handicap to hinder our efforts to find a just peace.

Mr. President, the statement of Charles H. Percy is the type of imaginative thinking desperately needed, in and out of Government, if our goals are to be realized. Therefore, I ask consent to have his statement inserted in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the statement ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

America's escalation of the war in Vietnam in recent days makes it imperative that we now quicken and intensify our efforts to seek a just peace. By bombing within 900 yards of a large civilian center, we have multiplied the risks of this war—the risk of Chinese intervention, the risk of enemy escalation, the risk of still more casualties among innocent men, women and children. If we must accelerate the war—as the Administration believes we must—then let us also accelerate the pursuit of peace.

As we all know, the enemy has indicated that he is not prepared to negotiate directly with the United States. Therefore, I urge a new approach to end this tragic war.

I earnestly suggest that a conference of all Asian nations be called to work toward a settlement of the Vietnam war. I further suggest that such a conference could be called by U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations. Himself an Asian, U Thant, enjoys the confidence of both East and West, and would exert an influence clearly free of national self-interest.

An all-Asian "peacemaking" conference would allow those most directly endangered to deal directly with the problem at hand. Its recommendations would reflect an understanding of the region which is essential to the restoration of peace. It would serve to find an Asian solution to a problem in Asia which threatens the peace of the world.

No one could guarantee the success of such a conference, but it is an approach worth trying. Perhaps an Asian conference would be only a beginning. But let us begin.

WHIRLWIND

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a thought-provoking and timely editorial titled, "Whirlwind—Dr. King May Reject It but He Helped Sow the Wind That Bred It," appeared in the Wheeling, W. Va., Intelligencer, on July 18. I commend to the attention of my colleagues this editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WHIRLWIND—DR. KING MAY REJECT IT BUT HE HELPED SOW THE WIND THAT BRED IT

That is a fine and deceptive line the Rev. Martin Luther King draws between racial violence and civil disobedience.

In the King formula you make certain demands on Government in the name of a minority group. The demands may be, frequently are, beyond the legitimate power of Government to bestow. So you "demonstrate" in support of them. You march en mass. You lie down in the streets and block traffic. You overrun a Court House. You obstruct the public in use of sidewalks. You interfere with the transaction of legitimate business. You court arrest.

Your conduct is deliberately provocative. It inspires rebellion by those you represent. When tolerated it leads to new excesses on the part of those into whose consciousness has been hammered the notion that they are an oppressed people. Its inevitable fruit is violence. And when it comes and the authorities try to restore order you shout of police brutality.

Dr. King may preach non-violence, but it is hardly coincidence that wherever he moves, violence follows. He may talk of peace, but his exhortations and demands breed riots.

Never before in the history of this or any other Country has so small a minority won so many concessions in so short a time from so large a majority.

In successive years Congress enacted sweeping laws in behalf of our Negro citizens which, in the judgment of many legal authorities and fair minded citizens, go far beyond both constitutional authority and a realistic concept of civil rights. And at the moment the lawmakers have under consideration in the name of racial justice a third piece of legislation in this series that unquestionably does violence to even a rudimentary sense of property rights.

In spite of all of this, indeed perhaps because of it, there is less satisfaction in the Negro community today than ever before, as witness such outbreaks as that now rock-

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

It reflects the high standards of workmanship and design which are a by-product of the American way of life. Many of these standards are required by law to guarantee safety for U.S. citizens and U.S. cargoes. The same standards, in most cases, do not prevail abroad.

Ship construction in U.S. yards is governed by the following requirements: Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act, Work Hours Act of 1962, Convict Labor Provision, Buy American Act, Small Business Subcontracting Program, Labor Surplus Area Contracting Program, Renegotiation Act of 1951, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, Examination of Records Provisions, Equal Opportunity, Armed Services Procurement Regulations.

Ship construction in foreign yards cannot be guaranteed as meeting these requirements without added costs—and added costs destroy at once the illusion that a bargain is possible through use of foreign shipyards.

The art of shipbuilding is on the brink of dramatic changes and improvement. New concepts and new ideas are being developed. Future progress must not be placed exclusively in the hands of other countries whose political objectives may, in the long run, be different than those in the United States.

Of this subject, the Chief of Naval Operations has said: "We all know that the more ships we have constructed for us in other lands and the more foreign bottoms we use to transport our exports and imports, the less need we have for shipyards in our own country. This, of course, means slow but certain death of those precious skills and know-how so essential to any sea power industry. This we cannot afford. We must become vitally—let me repeat, vitally—concerned with preserving and maintaining our repository of trained manpower resources found in our shipyard facilities."

Our International Union, in searching for a solution to the existing maritime dilemma, sponsored the National Shipbuilding Conference last November, here in Washington, D.C. This Conference was attended by representatives of over 50 labor and management organizations. At the conclusion of the Conference, those in attendance adopted a Consensus Report entitled "U.S. Shipyards, A Vital National Asset", a copy of which is submitted for the record. We feel this Consensus Report outlines the foundations of a program for stimulating the construction of the merchant and naval shipyards of our country.

Though our purpose is to create expanding job opportunities for our workers with resulting benefits to the national economy and the defense structure, it should also be noted that representatives of management joined in the formulation of this consensus.

The discussions with regard to the nation's shipbuilding requirements and needs for merchant shipping and naval support have for too long been marked by generalities and speculation. There has been a reluctance—either by design or coincidence—to get down to the specifics of effective solutions. There has been too much faintheartedness and pennypinching with respect to the costs of effective solutions. And in the alternative, there has been a quickness to advocate expedient measures which ultimately would destroy the shipyard capability of the United States sea power.

Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson has been the principal advocate of expedient actions. His wholly destructive proposal for the construction and repair of U.S. flag merchant ships in foreign shipyards has never been accurately assessed in terms of consequences on the national economy, the loss of employment for shipyard craftsmen, the contraction of essential shipbuilding and ship repairing capabilities to meet national emergencies, and the balance of international payments.

Instead, he has engaged in a mish-mash of erroneous or misleading statistics, curious arithmetic and outright hocus-pocus. He would place shipyard contracts abroad—to the impairment of our national interests—and to the detriment of our shipyard workers. He brands as "too expensive" something which our great nation must have to survive.

For a nation that values dearly freedom and security for all, a price tag should never be placed on anything that contributes to, or strengthens, those prized possessions. Each day, we make a distinction between necessary and unnecessary expenditures, and no informed authority would relegate ships and shipyards to the category of unnecessary. Through the years, it has been proven, time and again, that ships—both naval and merchant—plus shipyards are vital to our survival and to the preservation of our precious liberties.

From the standpoint of things which are necessary and essential, a few comments on the costs of each are important.

Within the framework of our "Consensus Report", we conservatively estimate that an annual expenditure of approximately $200 million could enable construction of ships in U.S. shipyards toward attainment of an American flag merchant marine which could carry an increasing share of our nation's trade and commerce. Included in this amount would be the requirements for domestic shipping. Is this too high a price to pay in an expanding economy and with an ever-increasing trade pattern? We say "no", especially when the expenditures will also have the consequential effects of gainful employment for our people, stability for our shipyards, and yields to the Federal Treasury in the form of personal and corporate taxes.

Certainly, a program in the magnitude of $200 million annually "to enable the construction in United States shipyards of sufficient vessels to accomplish the carriage of not less than 30% of the exports and imports of the United States aboard United States flag ships by 1975", as recommended by the Maritime Advisory Committee of which I am privileged to be a member, must be carefully conceived to permit optimum utilization of facilities and manpower. The program should be divided into logical yearly increments so as to achieve a realistic build-up and so as to achieve desired objectives in a reasonable period of time. On this basis, we firmly believe that Congressional approval will be forthcoming.

In the area of research and development for maritime and shipbuilding purposes, the pitiful level of governmental support in the last decade can only be explained by an absolute failure of federal leadership and bureaucratic bungling. No such mismanagement has been associated with the allocation of federal funds and national resources for aircraft and aerospace research and development, and there is no question about our nation's superiority in these fields. A fraction of what is spent for space research and development would vastly strengthen the American Merchant Marine and we therefore believe that an annual appropriation of $100 million for 5 years for maritime and shipyard research and development is not unrealistic or unreasonable. Here again, a careful program, incorporating the best ideas of labor, industry and government must be devised so as to take advantage of advancing technologies and new concepts. Opportunities for nuclear propulsion and complete transportation systems must be fully explored. Such an effort, however, cannot succeed without government leadership and financial support.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, I believe I speak most candidly when I say that the shipyard workers of this country—and their counterparts in other American industries—strenuously resent the harangue of a single governmental official—the Maritime Administrator—who would take away all or part of their livelihood through foreign shipbuilding and ship repairing. We are also disturbed by the fact that he continues on this course despite statements of other Administration officials to the contrary. In this sort of vacuum, the Congress must exert leadership—if not, we are fast approaching the point of no return beyond which retrieval of an essential maritime capability will be many times more costly than we presently anticipate—if not almost impossible. We, of the labor movement, are therefore deeply gratified by the Committee's searching scrutiny of the present serious situation—and we are fully confident that your decisions, recommendations and actions will be in the right direction.

Summary of direct and indirect assistance

Country	Direct		Indirect		
	Operating subsidy	Construction subsidy	Tax benefits	Loans and interest on loans	Other
Argentina	X [1]	X [2]	X [3]	X	X.
Brazil	X [1]	X	X	X	X.
Canada	X [4]	X [5]	X		X.
Chile	X [1]		X		X.
Colombia	X [1]		X [1]		X.
Costa Rica			X		X.
Ecuador	X [1]				
Guatemala	X [1]				X.
Haiti					X.
Honduras					X.
Mexico	X [1]				X.
Nicaragua					
Panama					X.
Peru	X [1]	X [6]	X [3]		X.
United States	X	X	X	X	X.
Uruguay	X [1]		X [3]		X.
Venezuela	X [1]				X.

[1] Consists of meeting deficits incurred in the operation of ships owned by the Government or in which they have an interest. No operating subsidy is granted to private companies.
[2] The Government owns and operates the major shipyard.
[3] The Government owned or controlled steamship line is exempt from taxes.
[4] Coastal trade only.
[5] Suspended February 1965.
[6] The Government owns the controlling interest in the major shipyard.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

of law clause of the Constitution. This subparagraph as I have pointed out, makes it a crime for a person who is in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings, and who is not exempted under 403(b), to fail or refuse to use his best efforts to consummate any sale, rental, or lease because of race, color, religion, or national origin of any party to the prospective sale, rental or lease. How is it to be determined what constitutes an individual's best efforts? There would always be room to say that he might have done something more, or might have done something sooner, or might have done something in a different way, which would have had a different result. Is the mere failure to have done things in a different way, or sooner, to be made the basis for a criminal prosecution?

That is what we will be getting to if we approve subsection 4 of subsection 403(a), as recommended by the committee of the other body.

There is at least one more unconstitutional provision in subsection 403(a). It is to be found in subparagraph 7 of that subsection, which makes it a crime for any person in the business of building, developing, selling, renting, or leasing dwellings, and who is not exempted under 403(b), to engage in any act or practice, the purpose of which is to limit or restrict the availability of housing to any person or group of persons because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

This provision is unconstitutional because it purports to make an act criminal simply by reason of the purpose with which the act is done.

This is bad, in the first place, because evidence with respect to purpose is extremely difficult to establish, purpose being a subjective matter, so that except on the basis of the direct testimony of the person charged with the offense, it would be virtually impossible to prove purpose with a sufficient particularity to meet the standards for a criminal statute.

Entirely aside from this point, however, subparagraph 7 of subsection 403(a) is void because purposes are thoughts, and only acts, not thoughts, can constitute crimes.

Subparagraph 7 does not require that the act or practice be successful in accomplishing the prohibited purpose. The subparagraph does not even require that the act or practice be reasonably calculated to serve the prohibited purpose. It makes the mere holding of the purpose, and the performing of any act or the engaging in any practice, pursuant to that purpose, malum prohibitum.

Under this subparagraph the act or practice is bad because of the nature of the act or practice.

The absurd results which would come about if this language should be enacted into law can be shown by a single example. Under the provisions of subparagraph 7 of section 403(a), as recommended by the committee of the other body, all of the good people who last year wrote letters to editors, protesting the sale of a particular dwelling to the Soviet Union for use as an embassy and living quarters for members of the U.S.S.R. diplomatic staff, would have been guilty of criminal acts, because unquestionably their purpose in writing the letters was to limit or restrict the availability of that particular dwelling on the basis of national origin.

How silly can you get?

Subsection 403(c) of the revised version of H.R. 14765 is also new language, and may be regarded by some as involving an improvement over the original bill. But it is not. This is a very puzzling provision. The subsection reads as follows:

> Nothing in this section shall bar any religious or denominational institution, or any charitable or educational institution or organization which is operated, supervised or controlled by or in conjunction with a religious organization, or any bona fide private or fraternal organization, from giving preference to persons of the same religion or denomination, or to members of such private or fraternal organization, or from making such selection as is calculated by such organization to promote the religious principles or the aims, purposes, or fraternal principles for which it is established or maintained.

It is easy to vision certain situations in which this subsection would apply, but it is hard to see exactly where it would stop. It could be contended that this subsection might operate as an invitation to the Ku Klux Klan to go into the property management business. If the KKK can be deemed a bona fide private or fraternal organization, then it would appear that subsection 403(c) would operate as a license to the Klan to make such selection of its tenants as it calculates would promote the aims, purposes, or fraternal principles for which it was established and is maintained. Most likely, that would be completely segregated housing.

Similarly, under this subsection, the Black Muslims, being a religious organization according to their own claim, certainly would be authorized to operate all-Negro housing projects, pursuant to their religious principle of racial segregation.

On the other hand, a neighborhood citizens association in an area of Maryland or Virginia suburban to Washington, not being religious, or denominational, charitable, or educational, would have to establish to the satisfaction of the court, or of the new Fair Housing Board, that it was a bona fide private or fraternal organization, in order to be able to resist encroachment upon its neighborhood of what its members might deem to be undesirable neighbors.

The ruling would be, of course, that the citizens association was neither private nor fraternal and that any action it might take in the direction of selectivity in housing would be deemed improper discrimination.

Section 403(c) is confusing as well as puzzling. If it should be enacted, it might raise enough problems to hamper enforcement efforts, and perhaps it is, in that sense, an improvement over the original bill. But it is not good legislation. It is not well drafted. It rests on a false principle, for it says in effect that religious or denominational institutions, or charitable or educational institutions operated, supervised, or controlled by or in conjunction with religious institutions, or bona fide private or fraternal organizations, have the right of private property to a greater degree than individuals. This I cannot accept, for it is false. I do not count subsection 403(c) as one of the five instances in which it may be claimed the revised version of the bill is an improvement. It is not.

Under subsection 408(d) of the revised version of H.R. 14765, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is to undertake investigations of alleged violations "either upon the receipt of a written statement of a person alleging to be aggrieved or his representative, or on the basis of information available to the Secretary indicating that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a violation may have occurred."

Since this language is stated in the alternative, it seems quite clear that while the Secretary must have available to him facts indicating reasonable grounds to believe that a violation may have occurred, in order to act upon the basis of his own information, there is no such requirement of reasonable grounds when the Secretary receives a written statement of a person alleging to be aggrieved, or a written statement of a representative of a person alleging to be aggrieved.

Mr. President, whatever may be the decision of the Congress with respect to the need for new legislation against discrimination in housing, assuredly we do not need a new court, by whatever name, to provide enforcement machinery. We do not need a new quasi-judicial body for this purpose.

State courts and the Federal courts are open. Enforcement of any proper legislative purpose can be achieved through these courts. Necessary adjudication under any constitutional law can be provided by these courts. It is not necessary for the achievement of any proper objective to legislate special and discriminatory remedies, or arbitrary procedures, or vast inquisitorial powers and vast regulatory powers combined in the same hands.

It is not necessary, Mr. President, to create a body which partakes at one and the same time of the attributes of administrator, enforcer, prosecutor, adjudicator, and litigant. But this is what the revised version of H.R. 14765 would do.

Far from being an improvement, Mr. President, this bill which has been reported to the other body by its Committee is substantially worse than the original. I would not have thought that possible, but they have managed it.

THE ESCALATION OF FRIGHTFULNESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post there appeared a very thoughtful and timely column by that distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, entitled, "The Escalation of Frightfulness." It speaks for itself. I would like to read it in full. However, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

in the RECORD, and I hope that people pay careful attention to what is pointed out in the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE ESCALATION OF FRIGHTFULNESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Because the Vietnamese war cannot be decided by military means, it has become increasingly a vicious spiral in frightfulness. Because it is both a civil war of Vietnamese against Vietnamese and at the same time a war of Vietnamese against foreign white men, it is, as such wars usually are, increasingly ferocious and barbarous. Unable to subdue the other side by conventional military actions, each side tries to overcome the enemy by destroying his will to fight. Frightfulness begets frightfulness and anger demands vengeance, and all that remains is a fury which, insofar as it reasons at all, thinks that by topping frightfulness with more frightfulness, the enemy will be silenced and paralyzed.

The world is now confronted with this escalation of frightfulness. To the American threat to bomb closer and closer to the populated regions of North Vietnam, Hanoi is replying by increasing its mobilization, by evacuating the civilian population from Hanoi and Haiphong, and by threatening to try the captive American fliers, humiliate them, and use them as hostages in the war of frightfulness, and, in the end, perhaps even to execute them.

There is no doubt that this treatment of the fliers would evoke dire reprisals. The warning of Secretary General U Thant and the declaration of the senators who have dissented from the Johnson policy in the war are accurate. They are telling the truth in calling the attention of Hanoi to the fact that the punishment of the prisoners of war would make the war, frightful as it is already, still more frightful. For the ultimate weapons of frightfulness are in the hands of the United States, and no one who knows this country and the character of the President can be sure that they will not be used if the escalation of frightfulness continues.

In this escalation we are approaching the point of no return, the point where the war becomes inexpiable, where it becomes incapable of rational solution, where it becomes a war of endless killing, a suicidal war of extermination. The war is not yet at that point. But the war will pass that point of no return if the prisoners are executed and the North Vietnamese cities are destroyed in retaliation.

There is great honor and glory to be had by anyone speaking for the civilized conscience of mankind, who interrupts and breaks the vicious spiral.

ANOTHER DOWNTURN IN DAIRY PRODUCTION HIGHLIGHTS NEED FOR EARLY ACTION ON SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM LEGISLATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in years past the special milk program for schoolchildren has been championed as a means of keeping dairy income up by encouraging schoolchildren to drink milk that otherwise might become surplus. Today there is no substantial milk surplus problem. In fact dairy production has dropped off substantially. The reason? Dairy farmers, who have to invest a great deal of time and money in their business, are not getting enough of a return on their investment to make it worthwhile for them to stay in the dairy business.

Some have pointed to this reduction in milk production as a reason for cutting back on the school milk program. Yet the school milk program can serve a very valuable purpose by raising dairy farm income and thus keeping many dairy farmers from selling their farms.

The milk program accounts for approximately 2.5 percent of the milk consumed in the United States. If this valuable tool for keeping milk demand high were dropped even more dairy farmers would be forced out of business as prices plummeted. The ultimate result would be a frightening increase in dairy prices as fewer producers struggled to meet the needs of a young and ever-expanding population.

The need for early action by the House on legislation extending the school milk program was highlighted this week by the release of figures indicating that June milk production hit a 27-year low. Milk production was the smallest for any June since 1939. It is noteworthy that at the same time as absolute production hit a 27-year low, milk production per cow was up 3 percent over June of 1965. This simply means that dairy herd sales are so great that, despite fantastic increases in productivity over the past 25 years, total production has gone down.

Consequently I deeply hope that the House will reaffirm its support for the school milk program and at the same time give dairy farm income a shot in the arm by approving legislation extending the school milk program.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. FRED BUZHARDT, SR., OF McCORMICK, S.C.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on July 6, 1966, I suffered a deep personal loss in the death by heart failure of a longtime friend and former law partner, the Honorable J. Fred Buzhardt, Sr., of McCormick, S.C.

Earlier this year he was unanimously elected by the South Carolina General Assembly to the bench of the 11th judicial circuit and would have been sworn in this November.

He would have made an outstanding judge, just as he had made an outstanding citizen, attorney, and legislator. He would have brought to the bench that rare quality of a great legal mind, tempered by deep compassion and understanding for all his fellowmen.

A kind and unpretentious man, Judge Buzhardt began his career in the offices of my father and myself in Edgefield, S.C. Later he moved to McCormick where he and I founded a branch law partnership, maintained jointly until I resigned to become a State judge in the same circuit to which he was later elected. He continued his law practice in McCormick until the time of his death.

During his life in McCormick, Judge Buzhardt served as town and county attorney and as chairman of the board of trustees for the McCormick schools. He also served as vice chairman of the South Carolina Board of Corrections, member and associate counsel of the Clarks Hill Authority, and as a member of the board of directors of the South Carolina Penitentiary. A member of the South Carolina House of Representatives since 1963, his record of public service reflects singular and worthwhile contributions to his State and Nation. A dedicated and astute legislator, his death came at the climax of his legal career when he would have become one of the last self-taught attorneys to assume the bench of a South Carolina court.

A profound student of the Constitution, Judge Buzhardt understood its true purpose and upheld it with great zeal and vision. He strongly valued the great heritage handed down by our forefathers, and throughout his life he directed his efforts toward preservation of those hard-won liberties. His community, State, and Nation are better places because of the services he rendered during the past 40 years.

J. Fred Buzhardt, Sr., was also a man of great personal qualities. He possessed tremendous courage, unquestioned integrity and was a tireless worker. He applied his immense ability to numerous problems, large and small, and, if an equitable solution was possible, he found it. He gave freely of himself in many worthwhile causes, and only a few who knew him intimately were aware of hundreds of acts performed outside the limelight and of the many lives his hand had touched.

Possessed of a deep basic faith in God, his stewardship was an example for all to follow. He used his talents in the service of his church, and through this work favorably influenced the lives of many young persons as well as others who passed his way.

Judge Buzhardt left a loving mother, a devoted wife, and one child, a capable son, J. Fred Buzhardt, Jr., four fine grandchildren, one brother, and three sisters, and other family connections. His son, J. Fred Buzhardt, Jr., has been a member of my staff for the past 9 years and is now serving in the top position in my office, as administrative assistant. This worthy son is possessed of a brilliant mind and is a patriotic and dedicated citizen like his fine father. To all of the members of his family I extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathy.

In the passing of Judge Buzhardt the State of South Carolina and our Nation have lost an able legislator, a profound lawyer, a patriotic and public-spirited citizen, and a fine Christian gentleman.

Judge J. Fred Buzhardt was one of the closest friends I ever had, and I feel a special and singular loss in his death. I ask unanimous consent to insert a series of newspaper articles and editorials, and the sermon given at his funeral, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These articles and my remarks reflect in a small measure the high esteem in which Judge Buzhardt was held.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

payments balance. But it points out that the government's calculation fails to allow for the "substitution" effect. The aid-receiving country, in other words, may use its aid dollars merely to buy goods it would otherwise have bought here commercially with dollars it already owned. It is then able to transfer its earned dollars for purchases in other countries.

SUBSTITUTION EFFECT

Strong evidence that this is happening on a large scale is provided by a comparison of our aid to and trade with Latin America. U.S. net disbursements to Latin America almost doubled from the level of the 1956–1960 period, when they averaged roughly $360 million, to an average of about $652 million over the 1961–1964 period. Total Latin American imports went up from an average of $7,650,000,000 a year between 1956 and 1960 to an annual average of $8,060,000,000 during 1961–1964, an average increase of $413 million. Yet total Latin American imports from the U.S. *declined* by an average of $100 million, despite the doubling of total aid and the "tying" of such aid.

There is reason to think that the "substitution" principle has an even wider application than the IEPA study estimates, but there is not space to consider its ramifications here. If the study has a serious weakness, it is in not giving sufficient emphasis to the effect of inflation and our chronic budget deficits in making the deficit in the balance of payments inevitable.

But the great merit of the study is its proof of the harmfulness of governmental restraints on foreign investment. A substantial part of our exports depends upon such investment. The study urges the government to give assurances that, in addition to maintaining the gold value of the dollar, it will not try to restrict or control the movement of capital. "The only really long-run factor working in the direction of eliminating deficits," the study insists, "is the growth in exports, income, royalties and fees which are related to direct private investments abroad. Any prolonged limitations in this area can serve only to weaken whatever long-range strength there is in the U.S. position."

CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES' TRIPS TO SOUTH VIETNAM

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, several Members have requested that a copy of the letter of the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS and the Honorable WILLIAM H. BATES, chairman and ranking Republican member of the House Armed Services Committee to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on the subject of congressional office seekers going to South Vietnam to which reference was made during the debate on the Defense Appropriation Act be placed in the RECORD.

I am happy to do so. The administration's actions in encouraging and accommodating this kind of politicking are hard to understand.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., July 19, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We, the undersigned, the Chairman and the ranking Republican of the House Armed Services Committee, are advised that there have been, and are presently, congressional office seekers in Viet Nam, dressed in military attire, being briefed by our top military leaders, being transported in military vehicles, aircraft and naval vessels and, in general, consuming the time of our key personnel of our Armed Forces. In our judgment, this political junketing should be banned forthwith. Even if such trips were advisable, it is difficult to see how we can accord such privileges to a few without extending the same opportunity to all. This would result in an utterly impossible situation.

Some Members of Congress, for investigative and legislative purposes, need to travel to war zones. We have been urged by the Administration, and privately by military leaders, to keep these visits to a minimum and we concur and have complied with these expressed desires of the Executive Branch of our government.

On the other hand, we deplore the excursions of those who have no responsibility in this area and who only serve to clutter up our limited facilities and impose upon the time and patience of our hard pressed commanders who are trying to protect the lives of American men who have been sent there.

Political bally-hoo has no place in an area where Americans are dying. Some of the statements which we have read border on or are breaches of American security and should not be countenanced.

Very truly yours,

MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman.
WILLIAM H. BATES,

BILL INTRODUCED TO PROHIBIT THE MAILING OF UNSOLICITED SAMPLE DRUGS AND OTHER POTENTIALLY HARMFUL ITEMS TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC

(Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. SMITH of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 16391 to amend title 39, United States Code to prohibit the mailing to the general public of unsolicited sample drug products and other potentially harmful items.

The problem this bill covers, was brought to my attention by one of my constituents, Mrs. Victor R. Struber, which is that unsolicited commercial items that are potentially dangerous to children and others, are being sent through the mail.

Numbered among the products involved are razor blades, drugs and chemicals.

While the senders of these articles may not be conscious of the accidents that could result, I feel it is a bad business practice and should be stopped. As in many other areas, what is good or not harmful to adults may be bad and harmful to children.

The bill I have introduced today will put an end to this type of commercial advertising, and the items involved will still be available in the normal course of business.

OFFICE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK OPENED IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Mr. KUPFERMAN at the request of (Mr. SMITH of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege this morning of attending the opening of the Office of the City of New York in Washington, D.C., at 1730 K Street NW.

This is a major step forward for urban areas, a first of its kind, and acknowledges the fact, long honored only by sufferance, that the activities of this Congress and of the agencies of the Federal Government have a major significance in the future of urban centers.

Not until the election of a former Member of this House, my predecessor, the Honorable John V. Lindsay, as mayor, however, did New York City accept this obvious fact.

Mayor Lindsay is to be commended on his perspicacity.

Members of the Congress from New York City attending the opening included: Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, and Congressmen JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, SEYMOUR HALPERN, EUGENE J. KEOGH, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, and JAMES H. SCHEUER.

I set forth here, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the announcement by Mayor Lindsay of the opening of the New York City office in Washington, D.C., and his statement with respect thereto.

OFFICE OF MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY, CITY HALL, NEW YORK CITY

Mayor John V. Lindsay today officiated at the opening of New York City's Washington office.

Members of the New York City Congressional delegation were expected to attend the opening at 9 A.M. Both New York Senators were also invited.

The four-room office is located at 1730 "K" Street, N.W. The Mayor said its purpose was to develop "an effective working relationship between the City and the Federal Government in matters of common interest."

In announcing the office opening, Mayor Lindsay said, "We are in sight of a new era—an era of urban renaissance which can be brought about through the joint efforts of the Federal Government and the Cities. But this new era will not occur automatically."

"Cities must fully understand and learn to work with Federal programs and the Federal Government must fully appreciate and learn to work with the problems of the Cities.

"In view of the fiscal straight-jacket in which regions like the New York City area today find themselves, it is essential that we do all we can to make maximum use of available resources. The establishment of a New York City office here in Washington will do much to achieve this end."

Mayor Lindsay outlined the functions of the City's Washington office as follows:

1. To serve as a liaison office between the City and Federal Agencies.

2. To coordinate the City's dealings with the Federal Government in order to take maximum advantage of Federal programs.

3. To assure that the Federal Government is kept informed of the problems, needs, and views of the City.

4. To keep the City fully informed of relevant Federal legislative and administrative developments.

5. To formulate necessary legislative proposals.

The Mayor also announced that he had asked Murray Drabkin, a long-time associate, to set up the office and to get it under way.

Mr. Drabkin, a lawyer, has had extensive experience in Washington, where he served

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1

as counsel to the House Committee on the Judiciary. More recently, as Mayor Lindsay's Special Consultant on Tax Policy, Mr. Drabkin was chiefly responsible for formulating the Mayor's overhaul of the City's tax system.

Miss Marian G. Clow, former administrative secretary to the Mayor when he was a Congressman in Washington, will serve as office manager of the New York City office in Washington.

Mayor Lindsay was present at the opening of the office and later gave a talk at the Sheraton-Park Hotel analyzing his approach to the problems of Federal-city relationships.

This address is here set forth in full.

TEXT OF REMARKS BY MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY AT INTERNATIONAL PLATFORM ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 20, 1966

I'm in Washington this morning for two purposes: To address this gathering and to open the first full-time, professionally-staffed office in Washington for the representation of New York City. The major purposes of the office are to provide New York City timely, continuing information about legislative programs and executive actions; to pursue City applications for Federal assistance and to maintain closer liaison with the New York City Congressional delegation, and, for that matter, all delegations.

The office has a name, a street address, desks, letterheads and a telephone number. The office, however, symbolizes much more than what may seem to be a pressure group working in behalf of the nation's largest city; the office stands for a conscious, reasoned objective of New York:

It is to achieve a creative federalism—one which operates vertically as well as horizontally. Heretofore, federalism has been interpreted as a division of powers and a separation of functions at the highest level, which is to say, the Federal level.

Our belief is that the cities are not wards of the Federal government, that they neither seek nor appreciate the hand-me-down status that is sometimes assigned to them, and that the stronger the relationship between those of us who serve the nation and those of us who serve its political subdivisions, the better the principles of Federalism will be fulfilled.

I should like to document that somewhat generalized viewpoint with specific examples of what New York City now is doing to simplify, to expedite and to solidify its relationship with the Federal Government.

First, we are consolidating over 50 municipal departments and agencies under twelve administrations. The Federal Government operates with 11 cabinet-level departments; we intend to operate New York City in much the same way.

Early this month, for example, we established an Administration of Health Services. It brings together under one command our 21 municipal hospitals, our nurses, our research staff, and all of the City's programs directed toward the protection of New Yorkers aaginst illness and disease.

On the face of it, an apparently simple administrative reorganization is less than exciting. The realignment, however, has been termed by Dr. Howard Rusk as "a milestone." He said of the new Administrator, Dr. Howard J. Brown: "He is a magnificent choice to chart the new courses in administrative procedures and patient-centered philosophy . . . With the help and understanding of all New Yorkers a new era of health services in New York City should emerge."

We also have consolidated the City's budgeting and bookkeeping under one head, the Administrator of Finance. It is his assignment to coordinate the preparation of the budget, the collection of revenues, the assessment of taxes, and other City fiscal responsibilities.

We are bringing together under a single Administration of Human Resources those City programs concerned with what I believe to be New York City's greatest single problem: The plight of the poor. Under this administration, a top executive will be charged with the formulation and the execution of programs and policies concerned with welfare, the anti-poverty program, youth work, and job development.

I think that in some respects our plans surpass the functioning consolidation achieved on a Federal level. For example, we are establishing a transportation administration to correlate the movement of people and goods within New York City, which involves a stoplight in a residential neighborhood as well as the construction of a new subway tube beneath the East River. The Federal Government has not yet given transportation departmental status. I would predict, however, as such interstate transportation problems as jet airplane noises and the abandonment of passenger service are magnified, that Federal Government will be compelled to give transportation an equal voice at the cabinet table with other departments.

Second, we in New York have conscientiously sought out men and women with an interstate or national viewpoint for positions in this administration. We feel this is valuable because in our developing relations with the state and Federal governments—relations which will to a large degree dictate the eventual ability of New York and other cities to meet the difficulties and travails imposed upon every urban center.

Accordingly, we have been able to recruit to New York City many prestigious staff members:

J. Lee Rankin, former Solicitor General of the United States, is serving as the City's Corporation Counsel;

Howard R. Leary, former Police Commissioner in Philadelphia now directs New York's 28,000-man police force;

Austin Heller, formerly with the Air Pollution Division of the United States Public Health Service in Cincinnati, is our new Commissioner of Air Pollution;

The City's Transportation Administrator is Arthur Palmer, who once served as Assistant General Counsel of the Lend Lease Administration;

Dr. Efren Ramirez, who achieved remarkable successes in the treatment of drug addicts in Puerto Rico, has joined the City as our Narcotics Coordinator;

The new Chairman of the Housing and Redevelopment Board is Jason R. Nathan, a former regional director of the Federal Urban Renewal Administration;

George F. McGrath, the well-known Commissioner of Correction for the State of Massachusetts, is serving in a similar capacity in New York;

My chief advisor on the reorganization and reform of the City's archaic and insufficient tax structure was Murray Drabkin. Mr. Drabkin was Chief Counsel for a sub-committee of the House Judiciary Committee that wrote an extensive report on state and local taxation policies. He will direct the Washington office we opened this morning.

In addition, New York City has been served in a consultant capacity by Mitchell Sviridoff, the nationally-respected expert on social problems from New Haven, Connecticut, and Edward Logue, who in Boston created a fresh, humanitarian approach to the development of more handsome, more constructive neighborhoods within the City.

It is common knowledge in Washington that my administration has called upon the Bureau of the Budget for both advice and talent.

We have borrowed from the Federal Government in other areas. Our Department of Purchase has been given enomously helpful advice from its federal counterpart, the Supply Service of the General Services Administration. As a result, we are buying more cheaply, and we are making better use of warehouse space. The Department also has established a motor pool based on the G.S.A. policies for the assignment of motor vehicles to government officials and employees.

Perhaps every mayor who has addressed a Washington audience has devoted a portion of his talk to a plea for greater Federal assistance in the solution of the varied and manifest problems he confronts. I shall not be an exception.

First, however, I think it proper to take note of the Federal Government's increasing interest in cities—most importantly, the creation of the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Medicare, specifically, is important to New York. Heretofore, New York City has carried the full burden of providing medical and hospital care for the aged who could not afford private treatment or hospital care. Medicare is relieving New York and other cities of a great portion of that burden. In the wake of the passage of the Medicare Act last year, many states have undertaken supplementary plans, one of the most ambitious being the "Medicaid" program in New York State. Medicaid will provide state financing to those unable to afford private health services regardless of age. Inasmuch as New York City this fiscal year is spending in excess of $550 million on hospitals and health services, State and Federal assistance is welcome. It is sensibly directed toward the needs of the cities, where a great majority of the indigent are living.

As I said, mayors who come to Washington customarily pack with them a standardized appeal for additional financial help. I won't belabor this gathering with a repetitive recital of these entreaties. I should say, however, on behalf of myself and other mayors, that we believe Federal assistance should be more directly allocated to the cities. Our reasoning is not complex; it is based upon the undisputed statistic that two of three Americans live in or around a city and the percentage is growing daily. In other words, when we speak of the Federal Government's responsibility to its citizens, we in effect are talking about those who live in our urban centers.

Yet the stated goals of our national government often seem to run contrary to the clear and uncontradicted needs of our urban society. All of us are conversant with those needs—the need for better schools, the need for safety in the streets and in the parks, the need for livable housing, the need for modern transportation systems, the need for available, reliable medical care.

Almost all of these needs arise from a single source. That source is poverty. It is mystifying that Congress did not approve a supplementary appropriation of $250 million in the Anti-Poverty Program for the last fiscal year—an increase which I urged the Congress to approve on behalf of the National Conference of Mayors. The United States spends more than $7 billion a year on agriculture, it has programmed upwards of $20 billion to explore the moon, and Defense Department spending approaches $60 billion a year. The same Federal budget provides only token funding for The President's Demonstration Cities Act.

As the astute Washington correspondent of the New York Times, James Reston, has noted:

". . . a Great Society . . . could, the way things are going, end up first in peace, first on the moon and last in the big American city slums."

I should make it clear in this rather somber report that we in the cities do not seek a dole. We realize that a search for individual self-sufficiency should precede any justifiable requests for aid.

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400090008-1